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Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a mid-term review of the Africa Regional Programme 3, Phase 2 (also known as KP Connect), a programme funded by SIDA and implemented through the International HIV/AIDS Alliance (the Alliance) in partnership with a regionally based management unit hosted by Positive Vibes, an Alliance Linking Organisation (LO) in Namibia. The programme is implemented in ten countries across Africa: Botswana, Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, and aims to create a more enabling environment for HIV and health programming with key populations in Africa.

This review sought to explore progress since the launch of the project at the end of 2014. The consulting team undertook a rigorous review between April and July 2016, assessing the effectiveness of the programme in achieving its intended outcomes together with any unintended positive or negative outcomes. The consulting team used mainly qualitative methods to assess the programme through visits to four countries where key informant interviews were used to collect information on the programme so far. In assessing the programme’s impact on the rest of the countries the consulting team conducted interviews on Skype or through email. A documentary review, and a final validation meeting attended by representatives from all surveyed LOs, provided additional information that allowed the consulting team to fully appraise, select and synthesise the programme context and related evidence. South Africa was not included in this review because LOs there were still going through the accreditation process. These LOs were involved in learning and sharing events but there are no plans for KP Connect to work more substantially in South Africa.

With a focus on key populations, KP Connect is well placed to address ongoing challenges MSM, transgender people, sex workers (SW), and people who use drugs (PUD) face in accessing HIV and health services. Halting the epidemic requires responses that are universal, contextual, responsive, informed, equitable, inclusive, and accountable. In particular, the project is highly relevant in the criminalised sections of key populations (KPs) and related services in East and Southern Africa. Levels of criminalisation vary from extreme cases, from countries where KPs and organisations that represent them cannot operate freely, to countries where they can operate in a fairly unrestricted way with certain legal obstacles. KP Connect is a change and capacity development intervention driven by the LOs and partner organisations in the ten countries. KP Connect utilises a management unit based at Positive Vibes in Namibia, rather than a top-down system led from the International HIV/AIDS Alliance Secretariat (Alliance Secretariat) in Hove, UK.

This approach forms part of a growing movement of strengthening organisational leadership based in the south. Even though we cannot ascertain cost-effectiveness at present, the model used by KP Connect has produced encouraging signs of success, as described in this review. It is partner-led with LOs, through the support of KP Connect, to develop tailored responses for KP programming. Also, through continuing support from KP Connect, LOs participating in the programme are expected to have stronger organisational systems for effective programme implementation and engagement of policymakers at national and regional levels. KP Connect has so far provided participating organisations tools and resources with which to serve their respective KP populations.

The results from the review indicate that, so far, KP Connect has made significant progress in terms of providing capacity building of LOs and regional knowledge sharing by LOs and KP CSOs. However, there is limited progress engaging with national policymakers on KP issues. There is a need to focus on this outcome in the remaining 18 months of the programme.

Under Outcome 1 the programme focused on technical assistance work with LOs. Institutional and technical capacity of the LOs has been enhanced through technical and financial assistance.

---

2 South Africa will not be included in this review due to pending LO accreditation.
mentorship, workshops, coaching, one-to-one and group meetings. Activities under this area were designed to be flexible and respond to each LO’s needs, issues, goals, political context and agenda. Like a à la Carte menu, a customised package of support was available to each LO. As such, each LO has been able to request tailored and specific capacity development programme and some of the key successes include the development of resource mobilisation plans and strategy development. Others areas of intervention were as follows: strengthening overall management, coordination and organisational functioning, revision of organisational documents; advice on activities prioritisation; facilitation of financial support to conduct certain activities and attend key meetings and strategic planning processes among others. A core mechanism underpinning progress has been rolling out the LiLO programme (‘Looking in, looking out’) across KP Connect. This is also a key achievement identified under Outcome 3.

The objective of KP Connect under Outcome 2 is for increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues, facilitated through a variety of strategies and approaches by LOs and KP NGOs. Progress towards this outcome has been relatively slow, with LOs and KP NGOs at different stages of engaging with KP work and advocacy, ranging from GALZ (Zimbabwe) who are a KP-led organisation, to SAT Zambia and TASOCODE (Tanzania) who are integrating KP work more strongly into their core organisational mandates. A way forward would be for KP Connect to support LOs and KP NGOs to strengthen their policy advocacy and design a generic blue print on how best to engage the governments that can then be adopted to suit local contexts. This initiative was explored in depth during and after the validation meeting (July 2016).

There was some progress towards KP policy goals related to HIV, health, and rights in a number of countries (for example, three recent court cases in Botswana, Kenya and Zambia affirming LGBTI rights and freedom of association). KP Connect has likely had some influence on such progress, although the degree is difficult to measure. This is similar to the case in Botswana, where BONELA played a crucial role in LEGABIBO’s3 successful challenge of the Government’s refusal to register the organisation. Not directly linked with KP Connect, this does demonstrate BONELA’s strong position to advocate for KPs and a strong foundation to benefit from KP Connect.

For Outcome 3, KP Connect has a strong focus on knowledge sharing. Learning and sharing events focusing on LGBTI (2015) and SW (2016) have been held and provided fertile ground for information exchange amongst LOs and partners. They were also opportunities to learn from organisations based in other global regions. Another achievement under this outcome (overlapping with Outcome 1) is the extensive use of LiLO across the whole of KP Connect. There have also been other valuable exchanges of information. For example, through KP Connect ABS gained insights into the importance of focal points amongst targeted populations (e.g. the police), aiming ultimately to reduce violence against MSM. Knowledge sharing has also taken different forms depending on the particular needs of the LO, one example being CHAU (Uganda) discussing media engagement with BONELA.

Linked with this Outcome 3 is the need for evidence, and this has manifested in a number of ways. This includes a systematic literature review completed at the end of 2015, exploring barriers facing KP accessing prevention, treatment, and care. This is a strong, worthwhile exercise and can form the basis of useful policy briefs for LOs and KP organisations up to, and beyond, programme completion.

Results from the mid-term review indicate that KP Connect delivers capacity building to LOs in a relevant and context-specific manner. KP Connect identifies the best use of the technical assistance, and the à la Carte menu provides the flexibility needed to respond to each LO’s needs, agenda, goals, and priorities. Depending on the initial level of involvement with KP at the beginning of the project, some LOs strengthened their organisation’s involvement with KP programming, whilst

---

2 Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals of Botswana
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others increased their role as leaders in the field of KP. Undoubtedly, progress has been made towards a wider recognition of KP needs and realities. For the medium to long term, LOs can aim to be leading voices in KP work at national and regional levels. Once engagement strategies with policymakers are clearer, robust, and coordinated (especially pertaining to Outcome 2) this will be even more likely.
1. Introduction

The Programme
The Africa Regional Program (ARP) 3 Phase 2, also known as KP Connect, aims to create a more enabling environment for HIV and health programming with key populations (KP) in Africa. The programme is funded by SIDA and implemented by the International HIV/AIDS Alliance (the Alliance) partly through the Alliance Linking Organisation (LO) in Namibia, Positive Vibes. It is a four-year programme, running from 2014 to 2017, that builds on more than ten years of programming experience in Africa. It extends work done in previous iterations of the ARP, with an increased emphasis on key populations and individualised capacity development for LOs.

The programme is implemented in ten countries across Africa: Botswana, Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Currently KP Connect has little engagement with South Africa due to LOs still undergoing accreditation, so nine countries are included in this review.

The programme is supported by Sweden and Norad’s regional HIV/AIDS team in Lusaka, Zambia.

Linkage between ARP 3 Phase 1 and ARP 3 Phase 2

ARP 3 Phase 1 [2011-2013] [Model projects]
ARP 3 Phase 1 ran from 2011-2013, with activities focusing on building the technical capacity of LOs and their implementing partners in programming, qualitative research, and development of a series of model projects in eight countries, focusing on community action for prevention of parent-to-child transmission (PPTCT) or increasing prevention access for sex workers (SW) and men who have sex with men (MSM). The projects typically focused on community-based outreach activities; increasing the availability of population-friendly services; and advocacy to help create a more enabling environment. Country LOs and project focus were:

- **PPTCT**: Alliance Burundaise contre le Sida (Burundi), Alliance Nationale Contre le Sida en Côte d’Ivoire (ANS-CI), AIDS Consortium (South Africa), and New Initiative for the Enhancement of Life and Health (NELAH) (Nigeria)
- **Key populations**: Zambia (Alliance Zambia to May 2013, Southern African AIDS Trust (SAT) from May 2013), Botswana Network on Ethics, Law and HIV and AIDS (BONELA) (Botswana), and Alliance Nationale Contre Le Sida (ANCS) (Senegal)
- **Community development**: Positive Vibes (Namibia)

Specific activities during ARP3 Phase 1 included selection and launch of 8 model projects, situation assessments and mid term reviews of model projects, strengthening of technical support hubs, and towards the end of Phase 1 preparations for transition to Phase 2 of ARP 3, which would focus more specifically on key populations.

Findings from an evaluation of Phase 1\(^4\) (the evaluation is included in Appendix 6) indicate that there was a range of positive impacts from the country projects. Outcomes, as reported by beneficiaries and stakeholders, confirm key benefits from project interventions in all countries. Community involvement was a central component, and capacity building of LOs included a participatory approach that has driven each stage of the model projects from their launch (including a needs assessment) to final evaluation.

---

Transition to ARP 3 Phase 2 [2014-2017] [KP Connect]

What was clear at the end of first phase of ARP 3 was some of the challenges facing key populations in their expression of personal freedom, protection from HIV risk, and threat from legislation that criminalises certain groups such as MSM, and sex workers. Consistent with the Alliance strategy extant at the end of ARP 3 Phase 1, the strategic direction of ARP was more explicitly towards key population programming. This included cross cutting issues with PPTCT (a strong component of Phase 1) which included, based on evaluation evidence gathered during Phase 1, a number of components that could be usefully integrated into Phase 2 such as difficulties accessing services, reactions of the general public and health care workers, HIV prevention, and community mobilisation, all underpinned by a human rights-based focus. An ARP Round Table during 2013 was a pivotal event in the transition of Phase 1 to Phase 2 of ARP 3, and confirmed that regional commitment to programmes addressing key populations can be based on current evidence and a shared acknowledgement of many individuals who are still hard to reach and fail to benefit from HIV programmes. The round table formed a bridge between ARP 3 Phases 1 and 2, and allowed a forum for open debate about what remain difficult topics in many African countries – from the perspectives of stigma and discrimination, and the prevalence of punitive legislation.

As a result, from 2015 onwards Phase 2 of ARP 3 (KP Connect) focuses exclusively on KP programming. It has three expected outcomes:

1. Improved technical capacity among civil society organisations to promote KP access to HIV, health, and rights services by end of 2017
2. Improved technical capacity among civil society organisations to promote KP access to HIV, health, and rights services by end of 2017
3. Improved processes for regional knowledge sharing and learning by LOs and KP CSO, by 2017

KP Connect aims to strengthen the capacity of LOs and their partners to address particular KP needs at the local level, providing technical and organisational support for robust and targeted interventions. KP Connect was launched against a backdrop of a real need to widen the policy space for KP, create sustainable KP systems, increase government engagement on KP issues, increase the evidence base on KP in Africa, put mechanisms in place to better respond to, monitor, and report on service access barriers, and strengthen collaboration between advocacy structures of civil society at national, regional, and global levels.

2. Scope and Focus of the Mid-Term Review (MTR)

The main purpose of this review is to determine what progress has been made since the beginning of ARP 3 Phase 2. It offers an important opportunity to understand what has worked well, and what has not worked so well, to guide any necessary changes in implementation for the last 18 months of the program and potentially into the next phase.

2.1 Objectives

The MTR seeks to address the following questions:

- What are the key achievements of the programme to date (covering the period from 2014 to early 2016)?
- How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
- Are the initial assumptions that guided the reformulation of ARP 3 phase 2 still valid?
- What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

---

1 International HIV/AIDS Alliance, ‘ARP 3 Phase 1 Completion Report’, November 2013
• What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
• How effective is the overall programme implementation model and approach for meeting the needs of LOs?
• What adjustments could we make to improve the quality and effectiveness of the programme?

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Data collection
Information was collected for this review in three phases:

1. Documentary review
This preliminary activity provided an opportunity to review KP Connect material generated so far. A list of documents is provided in Appendix 2.

2. Key informant interviews (KIs)
During the data collection stage 50 people in total were interviewed, individually or in small groups, using a data collection tool designed for this review (included in Appendix 3). A complete list of respondents is provided in Appendix 4. Respondents included staff from KP NGOs and LOs, representatives of national AIDS programmes (when appropriate), and key staff from the Alliance Secretariat and KP Connect team. The data collection tool focused on achievements to date, lessons learned, promising practices, success stories, effectiveness of the programme implementation model and approach for meeting the needs of LOs, challenges, gaps, and recommendations.

Data were collected from nine countries. The consultant team visited four countries:
• Zimbabwe and Botswana: led by Obrian F. Nyamucherera
• Tanzania: led by Ian Hodgson
• Côte d’Ivoire: led by Gaelle Bombereau-Mulot

The remaining LOs were interviewed by Skype or sent questionnaires by email. For this review South Africa was not included. This is due to new LOs still going through the accreditation process. The LOs have been involved in learning and sharing events but there are no plans for KP Connect to work more substantially in South Africa due to time and budgetary constraints.

The average time for interviews was 50 minutes and all interviews were conducted during May 2016.

3. Validation meeting
Initial findings were presented at a validation meeting held in Johannesburg on 6th July 2016. Attendees included representatives from nine LOs participating in KP Connect, the KP Connect Programme Manager, Programme Advisors, and the M&E Coordinator. This final report includes comments and input from that meeting.

An agenda and documentation for the meeting is found in Appendix 5.

2.2.2 Data analysis
The data collection tool provided a useful structure for review and analysis of findings. Each of the three consultants was responsible for one region (Southern Africa, Eastern Africa, and West Africa). Data were compiled using an evidence log to record and systematise material within the review framework. As with previous evaluations undertaken by this consultant team, findings were driven by a systematic qualitative approach, which adds value and depth to individual respondent insights.
and – more broadly – seeks for evidence to validate conclusions (Silverman, 2001, 6 Alliance/ICASO, 2010,7 Kielmann et al, 20118). All statements presented as part of this evaluation report are supported by evidence.

The final stakeholder validation meeting provided key insights into the initial findings and underpin core conclusions about the progress of KP Connect so far and plans for 2016-2017.9

---

9 Following the meeting, KP Connect produced an internal document, ‘Reflections on KP Connect Outcome Pathways Post MTR’, July 2016
3. Findings

This section will address findings in the following sections:

1. Overall programme management
2. Outcome 1
3. Outcome 2
4. Outcome 3

Discussion of the outcome sections will focus on key achievements, best practices, challenges and lessons learned, and recommendations. A summary of findings from individual countries/LOs is included in Appendix 1.

3.1 Overall programme management

Pertinence: KP Connect is well-placed and relevant

With a focus on key populations, KP Connect is well-placed to address ongoing challenges facing LGBTI, SW, and PUD in accessing HIV and health services. Halting the epidemic requires responses that are universal, contextual, responsive, informed, equitable, inclusive, and accountable. In particular, the project is highly relevant in the criminalised sections of key populations (KPs) and related services in East and Southern Africa. Levels of criminalisation vary, ranging from extreme cases in countries where KPs and KP organisations cannot operate freely, to countries where they are relatively unrestricted but face significant legal obstacles.

KP Connect, as a change and capacity development intervention, is driven by LOs and partner organisations in nine countries. KP Connect’s initial assumptions about the central role of LOs driving the programme on an individual country level are still pertinent. The precise form that KP Connect takes does vary, tailored as it is to organisational need and country context. KP Connect utilises a management unit approach, hosted at Positive Vibes in Namibia and with Programme Advisors based in Nairobi and Durban. This contrasts with previous iterations of ARP projects, led primarily from the Alliance Secretariat in Hove, UK, and forming part of a growing movement towards strengthening leadership and capacity in southern organisations to run regional and Africa-wide development programmes.

For individual countries, the focus on KP has been a mix of drawing on existing programming and expertise, or developing this perspective to a relatively new component, such as TACOSODE and SAT Zambia’s increasing focus on sex work in Chipata, and establishing a relationship with trans organisation TransBantu Zambia and other LGBTI groups. For both, KP Connect offers an opportunity to advance insights, knowledge, and programming capability: “People are contacting me to ask about next steps.” This is especially the case with the LILO programme which will be discussed further below related to Outcomes 1 and 3. For some countries integrating with KP was therefore a natural fit (e.g. CHAU), and for others allowed greater focus on KP. In contrast, for ABS it was not immediately a natural fit.

Good practice: ANCS in Senegal has a strong relationship with KPs. They can come into the office at any time. Supervision and monitoring of the NGO/IP is used to ensure activities are implemented as scheduled.

[Discussion, Assistant Programme Director, ANCS]

[10] Discussed in depth in the systematic review produced for KP Connect: ‘Exploring the Barriers that Key Populations face in Accessing HIV-related Health Services in Africa’ (2015). Katie MacDonald and Lidia Aklili
[12] Discussion with Sylvie Pawele, Regional Advisor, KP Connect
[13] Discussion, ED, TACOSODE
[14] Discussion with Programme Advisor, KANCO
[15] Looking In, Looking Out
(given their commitment to PPTCT) though previous experience working with young KP as part of the Link Up16 programme provided a useful foundation for expanding into other KP work.

All LOs are well-placed to make a difference. BONELA, for example, were key facilitators in enabling the registration of LEGABIBO17 and is at the centre of the struggle for KP rights in Botswana. BONELA engages with a number of committees where they can influence the HIV response.18 In Burundi, national stakeholders now see ABS as central to KP work (in particular with MSM), and ANS-CI provides technical and organisational assistance to NGOs in a context where KPs face significant stigma and discrimination. Through KP Connect ANS-CI can enhance the rights and participation of KPs by including them in project planning and implementation. ANS-CI also found an important niche in their extensive work with religious leaders. But here there is also the need to further involve KPs19 and ANS-CI faces a challenge from the political and criminalised context.

There are other barriers to effective KP work. In Tanzania, for example, TACOSODE is in a strong position to support KPs and the Tanzania Commission for AIDS (TACAIDS) acknowledge their contribution (and stronger capacity for advocacy, being ‘non-governmental’). But there is an essential lack of information in Tanzania about (for example) MSM and HIV prevalence,20 a knowledge gap reflected across the region. The example of TACOSODE/TACAIDS also illustrates a potential area of conflict, around language and TACAIDS’ preference for health programmes that address risks from anal sex rather than on the rights and safety of MSM per se.21 Here, and elsewhere in the KP Connect network, there is therefore opportunity for clarifying advocacy and – more broadly – emphasising KP rights.

Efficiency
KP Connect’s management unit approach is underpinned by a long-term accompaniment model and much of the responsibility for planning is undertaken at LO level. It enables flexibility, with activities shaped by individual country contexts rather than an imposed workplan, and with support from the two KP Connect Programme Advisors.

In this sense, KP Connect can be seen as an amalgamation of nine different programmes22 driven by a focus on KP issues. The model encourages a bottom up approach and enables LOs to utilise the support of KP Connect (capacity building and technical support) to develop and refine their own work. This is epitomised in the universal appreciation of the LILO KP programme, and that some LOs are keen to explore other tools and frameworks. For example ABS in Burundi plans to utilise the REAct23 tool after having already seen improvements in public attitudes towards KP, which are now “less taboo.”24

From a funding perspective, monies are allocated to LOs from the Alliance Secretariat based on regional and country level work plans. These are developed by the KP Connect management unit in consultation with LOs and the Secretariat to support regional learning events and, in some instances, cross-country fertilisation and support. This mechanism is probably the most appropriate for KP Connect’s model, though on the basis of discussions with LOs it can lead to some lack of clarity

---

16 Link Up is a three-year programme aiming to promote the sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR) of young people through the integration of HIV and SRHR services in programming and policy. More information is available here: www.aidsalliance.org/our-priorities/current-projects/28
17 Discussion, ED, BONELA, and reported 16 April 2016 at: bonela.org
18 For example: NAC, CCM, and Prevention TWG at NACA in Botswana
19 Discussion, KP Connect Coordinator, ANSCI
20 Discussion with Research and Policy Officer, TACAIDS
21 Group discussion, TACAIDS
22 Discussion, Programme Manager, KP Connect. In addition, KP Connect’s objectives across the project are ‘staggered’ and don’t move forward at the same time or rate, determined by the nature of an LO’s KP work.
23 REAct is a community-based system for monitoring and responding to human rights-related barriers in accessing HIV and health services. More information is available here: www.aidsalliance.org/about/where-we-work/506-react-guide
24 Discussion, ED, ABS
about funding streams. Whilst there have been concerted efforts on the part of the KP Connect management team, LOs and partner organisations have not yet fully embraced the transition from a donor led to a self-led programme. This transition needs to be managed strategically, especially related to articulating to LOs the nature of KP Connect’s support and how this can be delivered beneficially.

One key element cited throughout the respondent dataset is the absence of specific funding for an identified KP Connect ‘officer’ (though some LOs – such as ANS-CI – have created a KP focal person funded by the Global Fund who engages with KP Connect activities). From a conceptual perspective this may mean it is harder to appreciate what KP Connect is actually designed to do (apart from the compens review – formal and informal of leading to outcome realisation.”

This suggests there may still be ways to ensure LOs are fully cognisant of the nature and purpose of KP Connect. Compensating LOs and partner organisations for time and resources in some way may address some of these concerns.

There are some areas in terms of programme delivery that may warrant further analysis at the final evaluation. For example, the delivery of KP Connect is anchored in the accompaniment model where regional Programme Advisors guide LOs within the ambit of the programme. The cost-effectiveness of this approach can only be determined when the programme is completed and long-term benefits are more apparent. Funding is likely to be a prominent issue in the second half of KP Connect when decisions are made on directing appropriate levels of support towards high output activities.

The review suggests communication between the Alliance Secretariat, the KP Connect team, and LOs is effective and characterised by regular updates. The management unit approach (rightfully) leaves the locus of project management to the KP Connect management team, who at the launch of the project received additional technical support on the Alliance Secretariat’s sub-granting process, together with a full brief and templates. The management team have the requisite experience and understanding of context to oversee KP Connect and they have regular in-depth meetings for updates about developments in the field. There are also weekly discussions between the KP Connect Programme Manager and the Alliance Secretariat. In the context of KP Connect, the Alliance Secretariat focuses on issues of coherence and connection with/between Alliance programmes but aims to avoid micro-managing KP Connect from the UK (this would “disrupt the flow”). There was no evidence from this review that this is otherwise.

**KP Connect as a regional programme**

The structure of KP Connect, with its use of regional Programme Advisors, is dependent on effective communication and teamwork. Based on interviews for this review, the advisors’ role developed organically, initially identifying relative strengths and ultimately becoming complementary. Their support of the countries (allocated roughly on a 50:50 split) is highly valued by LOs. Their style is “formal and informal – I like it.” They are (various respondents), “responsive,” “wonderful trainers,” and “beneficial, especially around structuring our approach and work.” Regarding general documentation, it is noted that countries do not provide country reports. A financial report is sent to the Alliance Secretariat, and monthly calls for updates are requested from LOs.

The Advisors meet face to face at least quarterly but regularly share information and intelligence about progress and developments. In particular, LOs appreciate their detailed communication,
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25 Discussion anonymised
26 Exchange rates between currencies of the donor and Alliance/Positive Vibes resulted in other funding issues
27 Discussion with Grant Manager, Alliance Secretariat
28 Ibid.
29 Discussion, Programme Advisor, KANCO
30 This statement from discussion with GALZ
persistence, and guidance to ensure there is effective focus on KP in the midst of the many other projects with which LOs are involved. Technical support is also noted from Positive Vibes (outside of KP Connect) and the Alliance Secretariat – illustrated in assistance to design interventions for sensitising religious leaders in Côte d’Ivoire.\textsuperscript{31} Epitomising the Advisor role, for one Ugandan respondent, “Sylvie pokes you if you are quiet. She has been proactive as Advisor for the region to keep us awake.”\textsuperscript{32}

The KP Connect Programme Advisors are central in providing guidance and technical support to LOs. For example, for the KANCO Programme Advisor, “When I was doing the training [in Nairobi, with people] from Zambia, Tanzania, Uganda, communication with Warren was detailed and this enabled us to do the training.” There is also local support for documentation; when TASOCODE were developing briefs following the first LSE in Johannesburg, the Programme Advisor provided input and guidance.\textsuperscript{33}

In conclusion, with the locus of decision-making at country level (rather than the Alliance Secretariat), supported by the KP Connect team and Programme Advisors providing direct technical support, the project allows LOs to explore their own capacity development initiatives and needs. The advantage of this flexible approach is that:

“If something changes that we can’t change this [isn’t seen as a failure]. For example, in Burundi we can find different ways to work with them [in these difficult times]. ABS tells us what they can and can’t do, and we work with them. It’s NOT a failure, but a positive experience and keeps a momentum.”\textsuperscript{34}

**Best practices**

For programme management, there are a number of examples of best practice:

1. Delivery of a capacity building project in Africa managed from the region and promoting a flexible, country level approach.
2. Extending LO work on KP issues and integration of KPs at LO level.
3. Real advocacy wins emerging at the national level, empowering KPs and demonstrating the potential for KP-focused programming. For example, “BONELA has worked as an incubator for budding KP organisations and this has been a great contribution to the KP movement in Botswana.”\textsuperscript{35}
4. Integrating new perspectives into country level KP programming through LILO KP across the whole KP Connect network (acknowledged as beneficial by all LOs).
5. Sharing information and learning with other LOs - especially (for example) male SW at the LSE in 2016, and seeing how other LOs are implementing programmes.\textsuperscript{36}

**Challenges, lessons learned**

Ongoing challenges, and lessons learned, are already evident at this mid-term stage:

1. Communication can be challenging, as LOs are busy and overstretched at times.
2. There could be an issue about financial incentives and compensation of time spent on the programme for the LOs – this affected the responses in the initial stages, and there are LO-level views about funding described by respondents that may require further analysis to explore if this is perceptual or a real barrier (or both). A key element is that no core person in most LOs is funded for KP Connect (unless an LO has financial capacity for a KP focal
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\textsuperscript{31} Discussion, KP Coordinator, ANS-CI
\textsuperscript{32} Discussion, ED, CHAU
\textsuperscript{33} Discussion, Programme Staff, TASOCODE
\textsuperscript{34} Discussion, Grants Manager, Alliance Secretariat
\textsuperscript{35} Discussion, ED, BONELA
\textsuperscript{36} Discussion, Programme Manager, CHAU
person). For one respondent, KP Connect is an ‘added event’, with no funding held at the local level.

3. A linked issue, resource mobilisation, is addressed in the context of Outcome 1 but LOs do report some difficulties.

4. There are changes and factors in the local context that are outside of KP Connect’s control. Organisations could be going through changes, and engaging (for example) with Global Fund processes and audits, or impacted by political upheaval (in Burundi, for example). Keeping a momentum can be difficult.

5. KP Connect’s strong emphasis on learning exchange (which is valid) could potentially lead to limited focus on communities and individual lives.\(^{37}\) From this review, therefore, we would recommend ensuring there is a clear pathway of influence traced from regional activities through local technical support to implementation.

6. Work plans have been developed,\(^{38}\) and based on documentation received for this review these focus on financial components rather than details of planned activities, outcomes, and detailed indicators. This is not necessarily a negative, especially as KP Connect is designed to feed into existing (or new) KP programming at the LO level. Unless there is explicit connection with programming, however, this could generate lack of focus – for example (from our analysis) at GALZ.

The KP Connect team do recognise the nature of the programme as an initiative with the locus of change not on behaviour or improved service delivery but the LOs themselves, based as it is on technical support for existing or planned KP-focused activities. From a programme wide perspective, therefore, LOs can take the lead in ‘gathering’ from KP Connect, “The approach has been voluntary – how can you prescribe without resistance?”\(^{39}\)

---

**Story of a most significant change from Tanzania: Seeing a light at the end of the tunnel**

“A significant change is in attitudes from the police. At one time, it was very difficult for KP to sit at the same table as them and express their personal issues. Through SHARP, and KP Connect now you see the KP can sit in the streets [and at meetings] sharing their problems and challenges. [Originally] they feared being incarcerated or blackmailed or abused.

“This is likely to be because of SHARP and KP Connect – a sensitisation meeting was held for each. We included all stakeholders, including TACAIDS, the police, and KP such as those using drugs, and sex workers. They expressed their feelings, and during these meetings the police were transformed. They now say that they are ready to participate in programmes pertaining to KP.”

**Why did the attitudes change?** “When they attended the meetings they heard from the ‘horse’s mouth’ the pains and difficulties that KP experience. They realised these are human beings. We used the data to show prevalence etc. We showed the average prevalence in KP is x6 - so if infected they are likely to infect the general population. So after going through this data it did help - the police participants weren’t on a high level - but they are close to the community and may eventually be promoted.

“Both meetings had the same content - presenting data and testimonies from the victims. In the first sessions, we had one MSM living with HIV talking about his story about how it came about being infected with HIV and as a victim of stigma. So people had feelings. We thought that approach was useful and why we did the same in the second. Also we invited to one of the meetings a parent (of MSM) - to see how she was converted from mistreating her son to treating him as a human being. We used this to show other parents about how you shouldn’t mistreat your son.”

[Shared by George Anthony, TACOSODE, May 2016]
Recommendations for programme management

For KP NGOs

- Where possible, provide details of impact at the community level of interventions, especially (if this is attributable) those supported by LOs through KP Connect.
- Don’t be hesitant in communicating with LOs – and the KP Connect team if a line of communication is available – for specific areas of technical support that would improve the work with KPs.

For LOs

- Be explicit when operationalising planned activities and be creative in allowing KP Connect to nurture other KP-associated programmes.
- Ensure that whichever reporting mechanisms are in place are sufficiently rich and detailed to enable constructive and developmental feedback on progress and recommendations.
- LOs who also engage regionally can explore ways to integrate the benefits of KP Connect into new programming.

For KP Connect team

- Explore mechanisms for tracking ‘pathways of influence’ from learning and sharing through to the impact on communities.
- Funding mechanisms (and fund availability) are flagged by many LOs as an issue of concern – ensure that communication and information available for LOs on this issue is explicit and clearly defined.
- The management unit approach does reflect a natural evolution of the core nature of the ARP programme, with programmes driven from LO level. However, LOs will still require regular, consistent, and strategic technical support to ensure they capitalise on what KP Connect has to offer.
3.2 Outcome 1: Improved technical capacity among civil society organisations to promote KP access to HIV, health, and rights services by end of 2017

“KP Connect is aiming to transform the mindset of the people.”

Keys achievements to date

**Technical and organisational development skills scaled-up through technical assistance**

Since KP Connect’s launch, its main focus has been technical assistance and capacity building for LOs. Activities are designed to be flexible and responsive to each LO’s needs, issues, goals, political context, and agenda. Customised packages of support are available so that each LO can request tailored and specific assistance. At the outset, developing this approach required building an effective relationship with each LO, and an understanding of each LO’s current needs and capacities. As a result, initial capacity development planning meetings were held with all LOs at the beginning of the programme.

The most common inputs under Outcome 1 were related to resource mobilisation and strategy development. As some LOs face sustainability challenges, efforts have been made to address this urgently. Others areas of intervention include strengthening overall management, coordination and organisational functioning, advice on prioritising financial support to conduct certain activities and attend key meetings, strategic planning, and reviewing advocacy and communication strategies to include KP-related issues. For illustration, through technical assistance and mentoring in Tanzania KP Connect has helped TASOCODE clarify its positioning and strategy on KP issues.

“We are now more focused and we will be seen as working with KP and not just HIV. KP Connect has helped us document what we have. We HAD the ideas, but we now have the skills to come together and make the strategy. [The] strategy has been finished and shared with stakeholders at a one-day meeting. They gave input and we are now finalising [and it] will be launched this year. In the strategy we have earmarked some of the strategic objectives, such as making strong networks, and building the technical capacity of organisations and the [TACOSODE] members. We want to see more of our members working on KP issues, and the voices of KP to be featured in decision-making. The strategy will make us more visible.

Some LOs went even further. BONELA, for example, is committed to building a culture of excellence (exemplified by a ‘change pledge’ signed by all staff, and regularly reviewed). Significant positive changes in staff morale and performance have been observed and are sustained. KP Connect helped BONELA to explore changes in its approach and thinking around networking, placing more emphasis on coordination and resource mobilisation.

Assistance has been also thematic, as with ANCS in Senegal where KP Connect provided support for a countrywide dialogue to develop a regional concept note for PUD programming.

As cited in ‘KP connect, 2015 Annual review – Data summary’, the most useful activities under technical assistance, as ranked by LOs, were as follows:

- Ongoing support from programme Advisors
- Strategic and organisational planning
- Resource mobilisation or positioning workshop

---

40 Discussion, TASOCODE
41 BONELA, Program Manager
42 Discussion, TACOSODE Project Officer
43 KP Connect Annual Report 2015
44 KP Connect, ‘2015 Annual Review – Data Summary’
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Overall, how satisfied are you with the type and quality of support you have received from KP Connect in 2015? All participants were satisfied or very satisfied on a 5-point satisfaction scale.

BONELA commented, by email, that: “KP Connect is the best programme designed to respond to organisational needs as and when such needs arise.”

Technical assistance, within the context of ‘good practice’, has played a significant role at both organisational and individual levels, with staff members gaining a number of new skills.  

Discussions for this review confirm that all the LOs and (if interviewed) KP organisations acknowledged the positive impact of technical assistance received so far, and its relevance to their needs.

KP Connect has provided the opportunity to scale up the focus on KP by:

- Putting KP issues and rights at the centre of the work agenda (i.e. BONELA).
- Increasing LO visibility by positioning the organisation as a leader on KP issues and mobilising necessary resources (financial and technical) from partners (i.e. ABS, ANS-CI).
- Assisting with developing a more coherent KP strategy and move towards implementation (i.e. TACOSODE).

Stronger sensitisation of LOs and partners to KP issues: ‘Looking In Looking Out’ (LILO)

LOs participated in a KP version of the ‘Looking In, Looking Out’ (LILO) workshop, which is aimed at organisations and institutions wanting to engage more effectively with KPs. The workshop has been well received with many LOs expressing interest in adopting the product for their own use, demonstrating a greater understanding of and commitment to KP issues. As such, two training of trainer (ToT) workshops were held, one each in East and West Africa. Some LOs have already rolled-out the training at the country level with support from KP Connect. Participants of LILO KP training varied, depending on country context, and included staff from KP NGOs, LO board members (i.e. ABS, ANS-CI, BONELA, GALZ, and TACOSODE), law enforcement (i.e. ANCS and TACOSODE), and religious leaders (i.e. ANS-CI).

A formative evaluation of LILO conducted in two countries in 2016 describes positive outcomes at personal, organisational, and structural levels amongst all LOs. Direct outcomes of the LILO KP workshops are at both organisational and personal levels. LILO is perceived as an efficient workshop that strengthens links between organisations and made people think (personal reflections) about their own perception of KPs (MSM and SW). As mentioned by some LOs representatives (i.e. ANS-CI, TACOSODE and KANCO) the workshop was also beneficial for board members. By the end of the workshop, negative perceptions and fears of KP were removed, illustrated by one board member saying, “I can now sit with MSM or SW; we talk and touch.”

LILO KP has definitively played a significant role in broadening participants’ understanding of KP programming, the experience of LGBTI, and their understanding and view of the world. Participants appreciate they have another role to play by accepting the KPs “as they are” and supporting them in their choices. Indeed, for one LO, “Language has changed within the organisation as a result of [LILO], [as well as our] KP programming.”
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There is also better representation of KPs, whose recruitment at the LO level is another major development. For ABS in Burundi KPs are now represented at board level and on staff. ABS adopts a participatory approach when designing, implementing, and evaluating projects, which sensitises the team on KP issues and reducing potential stigma across the organisation.55

**LILO: Awareness raised amongst KPs and new partnerships created**

LILO KP has had positive effects on KP NGOs beyond LOs. With LILO, KPs have improved knowledge and understanding of their rights and legislation. For instance, LILO KP was a key activity bringing together police and SW in Senegal. SW have improved their self-esteem, a stronger advocacy voice, and leadership skills. The training offers room to talk about challenges, realities (such as racketeering, violence, and sexual abuse) and find solutions from a collaborative approach. With LILO KP, the relationship between KPs and the police has improved.56 This suggests that KP Connect is progressing towards its goal of achieving for LOs, ‘Good working relationships with a strong network of KP partner organisations and other key actors, including regional networks’, identified in 2015 as an indicator of programme success.57

**LILO: Limitation**

Some LO respondents mentioned that the ToT training might have been too short, with trainees not feeling fully confident or competent to replicate the training.58

**Best practices and box office successes**

The LILO KP workshops and institutional and technical assistance have significant benefits. All LOs and KP organisations confirm a positive impact. Other specific examples of progress include the following.

**Greater working relationships with a network of KP partner organisations: the case of Côte d’Ivoire.**

In Côte d’Ivoire, many KP organisations worked on their own with limited coordination between one another. Under KP Connect, ANS-CI sought to initiate stronger links between KP NGOs working with MSM, SW, PUD, and prisoners. Initially, the smaller NGOs were concerned they would be overwhelmed by the larger, being “eaten” by the big ones.59

Now, through ANS-CI’s technical assistance, KP NGOs are creating a network where they can share similar ideas and goals, especially related to accessing quality care and treatment, support for people living with HIV, human rights, and stigma reduction. In a context where most KP NGOs have similar donors, it has been acknowledged that harmonisation of goals and approaches, and sharing experiences, lessons learned, and good practices would make a positive impact at the country level.60

This federation of KP NGOs is a key step towards better visibility and to make KP voices “louder,” stronger, and content-based. As such they become effective advocates for KP and focus on achieving common goals collaboratively to address KP issues and promote human rights and prevent discrimination. The *Programme National de Lutte contre le Sida* (PNLS) is looking forward to working actively with the network and will support access to Government ministries, such as Justice, and Interior. The network will hopefully apply pressure to generate positive change.61 However, there
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are still gaps to be addressed by the LO and the national HIV programme. For example, strengthening the leadership capacity of KP NGOs, resource mobilisation, and sustainability. This is consistent with another indicator identified in 2015, ‘A clear strategy around KPs and internal commitment to that strategy and/or strong integration of KPs into a living organisational strategy’. 62

Challenges, lessons learned

Ongoing challenges are already evident at this mid-term stage. These are:

At KP NGO level

- Some KP NGOs require further development, and are not yet fully autonomous.
- Lack of budgets to support KP NGOs needs, e.g technical assistance for LGBTI organisations.
- In Tanzania, the LO is concerned there is perceived competition between them and the KP NGOs:

  “[They think] we are a threat to them, [that] TACOSODE was building an empire and saying “[But] TACOSODE are not KP!” They are afraid. Because of that they try and suppress us. A solution is to be ‘nice’ to them, but the programme should promote to others the benefits of working with TACOSODE.”63

At the LO level

- Lack of funding (even small) to undertake activities and/or fund KP NGOs.
- For some LOs, there was a perceived disconnect between the ARP model projects (ARP 3 Phase 1), which focused on service delivery, and KP Connect.64 It took a little time for some LOs to adjust to the new project format.
- In some countries workplan validation took some time to finalise both in 2015 and 2016.
- LO KP Connect focal people are not financially compensated by KP Connect for their time spent engaging with the programme (see section above on KP Connect overall programme management).
- Difficulties working in close collaboration with the media due to cultural barriers, and journalists in many countries predisposed to reporting negatively about KPs.
- High level of stigma and discrimination remains amongst health care workers towards KP, especially in rural areas.

At KP Connect team level

- Beside current efforts to measure the benefits of LILO workshops, further tools and indicators are required to assess the impact of new learning and technical assistance provided by KP Connect. As planned in the current M&E framework, a follow up evaluation 1-2 years after KP Connect closes will capture and document long-term programme outcomes.

Comments

Since the beginning of KP Connect a great deal of focus has been on Outcome 1. Institutional and technical capacity have been enhanced through mentorship, workshops, coaching, and one-to-one/group meetings. The beneficiaries are primarily LOs, but KP NGOs have also progressed. Feedback so far is positive and respondents claim a high level of satisfaction with technical assistance received.

62 KP Connect, ‘Africa Key Populations Capacity Building Programme M&E Framework (How Outcome 1 will look if we are successful)’ (2015)
63 Discussion, TASOCODE
64 For example, BONELA, and ABS.
However, it remains important to track the outcomes of technical assistance over time. With so much effort devoted to training and support, the real question is this: Did anyone really learn? Did organisations change for the better? New learning and improved understanding of issues need time to be digested and put into practice, and it is highly recommended monitoring and evaluating is undertaken of technical assistance provided to LOs and, where necessary, KP organisations to determine impact. By the end of the project, the KP Connect team should be in a position to provide a clear picture of performance and skill improvements\(^{65}\) attributable to technical assistance provided as part of the programme.

With regard to LILO KP, the creation of ToT certification certainly adds value to this component of technical assistance.\(^{66}\) A broader system to track improvements remains necessary, especially to explore the following expected areas of change:\(^{67}\)

1. Personal change.
2. Group and Organisational change.
3. Practitioner development.
4. Movement building and strengthening.

An end-of-project evaluation utilising an approach such as most significant change will provide useful findings to answer these questions.

**Recommendations**

**For KP NGOs**

- Continue to strengthen leadership and self-esteem skills amongst KP NGOs. LILO Identity\(^{68}\) would be a vital tool to use.
- Further develop managerial and resource mobilisation skills amongst NGOs.

**For LOs**

- Plan and budget for M&E as an integral component of programming to capture the impact of activities (capacity building, LILO KP, REAct, etc.), document evidence, and promote lessons learned and good practices at the national and regional level.
- Design and implement activities for the media and key decision makers to promote a coherent and collaborative approach towards KP issues. This could include training for journalists.

**For KP Connect team**

- Monitor and evaluate technical assistance provided to LOs in order to collect evidence of capacity building successes, and consider evaluating the impact of support for KP NGOs work, if this is a relevant component, with the LO.
- Complete as soon as possible certification of new LILO KP trainers to ensure the highest standards for country rollout of LILO KP workshops.

---

\(^{65}\) OD and technical related skills

\(^{66}\) The mid-term review team did not have a chance to review the full accreditation process protocol. The document is still in progress to be finalised.


\(^{68}\) LILO Identity is aimed specifically at strengthening KP self efficacy.
3.3 Outcome 2: In at least 6 countries, the Alliance can demonstrate increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues, by end of 2017

Key achievements to date

Under this outcome, the main objective of KP Connect has been to ensure the increased engagement of LOs and KP organisations, together with national policymakers, on KP issues'. This is necessary, not least because the socio-cultural and political environments where KP Connect is implemented are characterised by significant discrimination. Respondents highlight that KPs are often criminalised and face discrimination at multiple levels, and that even though KP issues are flagged, government policymakers often remain largely unresponsive to the need for a change in behaviour, attitudes, and punitive legislation.

In the early responses to HIV in countries with generalised epidemics, KP issues were ignored, partly because they concerned a relatively small proportion of the population but as countries bring the epidemic more under control KPs now pose a risk to the general HIV response if not addressed. In addition, major donors, such as the Global Fund, now insist on the incorporation of the views and input of KPs and organisations that represent them thereby forcing even the most conservative of governments to tackle KP issues. Under KP Connect some progress has been made towards achieving KP policy goals related to HIV, health and rights, for example the three recent court cases in Botswana, Kenya, and Zambia that affirmed LGBTI rights and freedom of association. KP Connect has had some influence on such progress, although the degree is difficult to measure.

In 2015, KP Connect concentrated heavily on Outcome 1, an important starting point for working with LOs and building relationships, trust, commitment to KP issues, and organisational capacity. This was clearly valuable in creating a solid foundation for implementing and amplifying KP-focused programmes. Within this context there was less emphasis on advocacy activities, and progress under Outcome 2 is therefore relatively limited to date. Though LOs are working to engage with governments and promote KP issues this is perhaps a little unstructured. LOs could benefit from a generic (but customisable) blueprint on government engagement in the context of KP issues and prohibitive policies and legislation.

Progress is evident: some agencies are listening

There is some progress towards Outcome 2, for example BONELA contributes to influential committees such as the Prevention TWG at the National AIDS Coordinating Agency (NACA) and the Global Fund CCM to promote KP issues. Two further examples are provided.

Firstly, in Tanzania, TACOSODE has engaged government officials on KP work, particularly the official AIDS agency, TACAIDS, and has participated in evidence gathering. In the period under review TACOSODE hosted a government engagement and sensitisation workshop on HIV and LGBTI. In addition, through sensitisation meetings at different levels, it captured the attention of law enforcement officers, policymakers, municipalities, and health service providers on KP issues. TACOSODE advocates for KP rights to basic health services at both community and national levels (this is a relatively recent strategy for TACOSODE), but lack of clear and disaggregated data on KP in Tanzania is a clear barrier to progress.

Secondly, in Kenya, KANCO ensures that KP issues remain on the agenda in key national policy processes such as that of developing the strategic framework. KANCO has participated in national policy framework meetings to ensure these mechanisms are inclusive of all affected key populations. As part of the policy engagement efforts with government they invited members of the National AIDS and STI Control Programme (NASCOP) and the Kenya CCM to the LSE and LiLO trainings
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respectively, enhancing the engagement of policymakers and potential for dialogue. Due to the sensitivity of KP issues in Kenya KANCO is taking small strategic steps to make sure that any gains are sustained.

**Approaches for engagement**

In Zambia, SAT Zambia is emerging as an authority on LGBTI issues in an environment where negative religious and cultural attitudes require organisations to maintain a strong focus on KP issues. SAT Zambia have developed a community engagement model to use for advocacy and, as part of efforts to build capacity of in country partners and encourage dialogue, organised a LILO KP training bringing together members of the LGBTI community, government officials, SAT board members and staff. Efforts to involve the National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Council (NAC) in the LSE on sex work (2016) also yielded positive engagement with national authorities. In Senegal, ANCS also utilises LILO KP to engage with policymakers. Here, the workshop is used for advocacy and targeting law enforcers’ representatives who requested training for their colleagues as a way to raise awareness and change attitudes. As a result of REAct and LILO training, decision makers better appreciate that KP have the same rights (as ‘humans’) as others.

As another example of engagement, in Botswana BONELA’s approach to working with government so far has been mostly (often by necessity) confrontational, but it has won important cases. This has the risk of making the government cautious, but BONELA (according to our analysis) is in a strong position to start a campaign for decriminalising KPs, gathering allies, and promoting better understanding of legislation.

**Barriers: a hostile environment**

Promoting KP issues can be dangerous, and LOs face difficulties when an environment is especially hostile. Some LOs confront this head on at the policy level. For example, CHAU in Uganda are part of a national steering committee focusing on KP issues, and pushed for the inclusion of KP in the revised National Service Plan. CHAU is also engaged with the agenda of the Technical Working Group within the Ministry of Health. Likewise, GALZ in Zimbabwe has concentrated on sensitising civil society representatives, religious leaders, and LGBTI youth activists as part of their advocacy efforts. As a result, alliances have deepened and a strong interest expressed on the part of both civil society and church leaders to increase exposure to KP issues. This has contributed to ongoing engagement of government and stakeholders at different levels, especially in addressing stigma and discrimination.

**Best practices and box office successes**

- LILO KP has been integrated into the work of many partners within KP Connect, such as GALZ and ANS-CI in Global Fund work, to increase programme impact and reach.
- BONELA has built upon the success of winning the case of registering LEGABIBO, a KP organisation in Botswana (not attributable to KP Connect) by promoting other KP advocacy such as supporting a councillor to present and have a motion on KP passed at the local government level.
- In part as result of capacity building, SAT Zambia is now recognised at the national level as a key NGO focusing on LGBTI. In addition, as part of their government engagement strategy, they invited a representative from the National AIDS Council (responsible for revising the National Strategic Plan for HIV) to the LSE in 2016. Information gained is being used in the revision and drafting of the new NSP. This enhanced the relationship between SAT Zambia and the National AIDS Council and cemented their role as a ‘player’ in advocating for KP rights.
- TACOSODE has integrated KP work into their partner network and is now seen as the ‘go to’ organisation on KP issues in Tanzania by the government AIDS agency, TACAIDS.
• In Côte d’Ivoire, the collaborative approach to KP work, and engagement with official agencies, has been central to programme progress. Key partners, such as PNLS, are part of the effort, and there is motivation and enthusiasm to design and implement an action plan collaboratively for maximum impact.

Challenges, lessons learned

Challenges are already evident at this mid-term stage. These are:

• Lack of data. In most countries there are large data gaps in terms of KP population estimates and HIV prevalence rates. Limited data can inhibit effective advocacy, and LOs do call for valid information though are also acutely aware of the Catch-22 paradox – trying to protect discriminated groups whilst at the same time wishing for more information about them.

• The need to define and address advocacy in the context of the programme. For the future, KP Connect can explore developing a training package for LOs, and a process for promoting policy advocacy to enhance Outcome 2. Within KP Connect there are a number of organisations with expertise and this can be prioritised as the programme shifts from planning to implementation, promoting government engagement.

• The challenge of working with decision makers is that it is not simply promoting marginalised populations, but ensuring access to services as members of the community. KPs are seen negatively so it is important to ensure decision makers understand rights of access.

Some of the lessons learnt across KP Connect for Outcome 2 include:

• When working with governments, caution, tact, and diplomacy are required. KP issues are largely fluid and highly contentious. When engaging government, automatic confrontation may erode trustworthiness as a potential partner. Subtlety and patience may be more effective, and gathering allies.

• The need for a government engagement plan - a blueprint - to provide LOs a clearer pathway for working with decision-makers and become stronger agents of change.

• Care when engaging with the media (especially if the message is to criticise government). Influence of government allies would be more powerful.

• There is often suspicion of NGO’s KP agendas and perceptions that issues are driven by ‘foreigners’ rather than being home grown. This potentially creates a rift between government and civil society as they struggle to find a common position on whether the KP issues being presented are foreign or reflect the situation on the ground within the different countries.

• LOs would benefit from training on communication with media - tools for sensitising media on HIV, KP issues, and the lived experience of those affected.

• There is still a huge knowledge gap across the regions on KP issues. LOs may benefit from guidance to articulate the issues effectively.

• Safety and security for KP, and organisations working with KP, is difficult in many countries.

• The need to develop meaningful partnerships with non-KP organisations that may be well placed to address KP issues but lack specific expertise.

Comments

With the ever-present risk of a lack of trust between government and NGOs working with KPs, a strategy for government engagement to guide KP Connect’s LOs would be valuable. In addition, for
effective programming (at all levels) and successful advocacy, there is a crucial need for evidence. KP Connect has already generated useful material, and it may be appropriate to support LOs in conducting their own data collection for focused advocacy.

Recommendations

For LOs

- Continue to focus on providing linkage between KP at the community level and national level policymakers.

For KP Connect team

- KP Connect would benefit from a stronger focus on Outcome 2 2016-2017. Government engagement and advocacy remain central to addressing KP issues in countries that are part of the programme.\textsuperscript{73}
- There is a need to develop a guidance document (blueprint) on advocacy and engagement of policymakers that can be adopted by the countries.
- Consider enhancing media engagement to advance the interests of KPs and the organisations that represent them. This will help shape public perceptions and ultimately impact on policymakers.

\textsuperscript{73} The reviewers acknowledge this will be a strong focus in the second half of the programme, as discussed at the Validation Meeting [160706] and in KP Connect’s post Validation Meeting document, ‘KP Connect Outcome 2: The Way Forward’ (8 July 2016)
3.4 Outcome 3: Improved processes for regional knowledge sharing and learning by LOs and KP CSO, by 2017

Key achievements to date

The KP Connect programme has a strong focus on knowledge sharing, and a range of learning events have been described in the Interim and Annual reports (2015). The mechanisms have been varied and include regional and national level events, and LO support for CSO partners. Key achievements for the project have included two LSE workshops and the rolling out of the LILO programme. There have been useful exchanges of information – for example ABS gained insights into the importance of having focal points amongst the targeted population (i.e. police), aiming ultimately to reduce violence against MSM.74

Regional knowledge through the LSEs is beneficial for both LOs and KP organisations

The first LSE was held in Johannesburg in July 2015, and was attended by LOs and KP organisations. The central theme was HIV programming for MSM and the broader LGBTI community and it provided an opportunity to share collective knowledge and experience75 and to outline practical steps for continued learning and cross-programme linkages. KP Connect was, at the time, entering a new phase of work and the outcomes of the LSE include a range of available resources tools and focal points. Another practical outcome of the event, aside from sharing intelligence about (and of relevance to) KP Connect partners, was establishing collaborative working relationships that continued through the final phases of SHARP and Link-Up, enabling more effective work in countries where multiple programmes operate concurrently. The LSE also offered an opportunity for KP NGOs to be involved in learning exchange – taking someone out of his or her office to the LSE.76 There was also valuable input from MENA colleagues, who shared their experience of working with MSM in hostile environments.

The second LSE, focusing on sex work, was held in April 2016, co-hosted by ANCS, with significant inputs from the Alliance Secretariat and the African Sex Workers Alliance (ASWA). As with the first event, this enabled a detailed exploration of the lives of a KP, and key examples of learning included (for example) the benefits of a SW network and the need for data. Following the LSE, Sisonke (a movement for SW based in Cape Town) implemented a study about SW population size in the Southern Africa. As with the previous LSE, there were significant benefits in hearing from KP working in other global regions. At the LSE there was a discussion on expanding the autonomy of SW, learning from the experience of SW in Latin America77 who had much to share about initiatives to empower and protect SW.

The mechanism of LSEs is therefore highly relevant for learning, reflecting on, and sharing at the programme level.78 LOs found particular elements especially useful, for example during LSE 1 CHAU valued an exchange with BONELA about working with the media: “This was an awakening.”79 In addition, following one LSE, CHAU submitted a proposal on SW to the Elton John Foundation, feeling “sufficiently positive about looking at resources and using a concept.”80 There is also anecdotal evidence that learning has led to increased confidence in supporting KPs, illustrated at CHAU where KP are now involved in running the Twitter account and maintaining a Facebook page.

74 Discussion, Programme Coordinator, ABS
75 KP Connect Annual Report, 2015
76 Discussion, Programme Manager, CHAU
77 AND SOPPEKU, President, May 2016 [Written Skype interview]
78 Derived from discussions, ANS-CI
79 Discussion, Programme Manager, CHAU
80 Discussion, Policy Manager, CHAU
Gathering new evidence – currently useful, much potential, and needs sharing widely

Gathering evidence to be shared as part of KP Connect has manifested in a number of ways (and is explored in depth for Outcome 1, above). Briefly, a systematic literature review was completed at the end of 2015,\(^{81}\) exploring access barriers for key populations to HIV-related health services. It sought to explore the barriers KP face in accessing HIV prevention, treatment and care services in KP Connect countries. This is a strong and worthwhile exercise, and can form the basis of useful policy briefs for LOs and KP organisations. Similarly, a Regional Social Network Mapping was undertaken,\(^{82}\) providing useful information on levels of knowledge of KPs and how that knowledge is shared between actors. It was developed to inform the type of activities included under Outcome 3 of KP Connect,\(^{83}\) and it would be useful to see how the findings of this exercise inform the work of LOs and the Alliance Secretariat.

Other examples are case studies and internal documents produced by LOs. For example, TASOCODE has developed a case study on meaningful engagement with MSM, and, with the support of the Programme Advisor, a larger KP strategy document.\(^{84}\) ANCS also produced a case study on MSM interventions in a hostile environment, and these and other outputs are vital to ensure KP interventions are evidence-based.

Finally, the hosting by Positive Vibes of the Alliance Centre for HIV, Health and Rights of Key Populations is a strategy to locate thematic expertise and technical leadership for work with key populations – specifically SW, LGBTI people, and people living with HIV – within the global South. This strategy is consistent with a principle within the Alliance to more broadly distribute leadership across the Alliance family.\(^{85}\) This initiative offers an additional resource for KP capacity building in eastern and southern Africa, and has the potential to promote closer LO involvement in KP advocacy at the regional level.\(^{86}\)

LILO: “For me it was the biggest learning”

Respondents interviewed for this review, and as reported in KP Connect progress reports, cite the importance of LILO (as discussed in Outcome 1). As a mechanism for sensitising LOs and CSOs to LGBTI issues it has been invaluable, including for LOs with a pre-existing KP component. Attendees have included LO staff, KP NGOs, board members, and other stakeholders (including the police).

“[The] best was the LILO KP training. It’s a training that helped to bring it home – with lots of conversations, and [hearing] experiences of KP and their [lives]. [It helped us] understand issues of ‘coming out’, looking into yourself. For me it was the biggest learning.”\(^{87}\)

“We attended a [LILO] meeting with Warren. It changed my mind around the issue of KP - we always thought about drug users, but here we talked about MSM. They are part of the community. The sense of stigma cause problems - I have a child and I don’t know what he will be - we were thinking all together and [we are] all the same people, and need to access all services.”\(^{88}\)

For KP organisations, LILO KP can be significant: for example, SANA (Tanzania): “We are KP groups - MSM, SW, and TG. So [LILO has] given us things that we didn’t know - vulnerability to HIV - so many things, including psychological, emotional, and physical. So it has been useful - facilitating learning

\(^{81}\) Katie McDonald and Lidia Aklili (Positive Vibes), ‘Exploring the Barriers that Key Populations face in Accessing HIV-related Health Services in Africa’ (2015)
\(^{82}\) Katie MacDonald/KP Connect, ‘Mapping knowledge sharing networks between Alliance partners of the KP Connect Programme (2015)
\(^{83}\) Discussion, Regional Advisor, KP Connect
\(^{84}\) KP Connect and TACOSODE, ‘KP Strategy: Exploring the Possibilities’ (2016)
\(^{85}\) Positive Vibes, ‘Alliance Centre – Influence Offering Concept’ (2016)
\(^{86}\) Discussion, Programme Manager, KP Connect
\(^{87}\) Discussion, Programme Manager, CHAU
\(^{88}\) Discussion, Board Members, TACOSODE
about KP. Most important thing is looking in and looking out - what we are about, and looking out at the world.”

The formative evaluation of LILO KP from 2016 states it has “been enthusiastically received and there is evidence to suggest it has had a positive effect on individual and organisational values and behaviours.”

Other ways to share and learn – much potential

As stated in the 2015 annual report, one-on-one regional exchanges are yet to be fully developed but there have been some developments. For example, in November 2014 the ANS-CI programme officer travelled to Burundi for a horizontal learning exchange with ABS, another LO where a PPTCT-focused model project is in place. The exchange enabled the two organisations to share common experiences and best practices, learning, and challenges in relation to PPTCT programming and sustainability. For this review, there is limited evidence to suggest many similar activities have occurred but some organisations, such as GALZ, expressed interest in participating in exchanges. The regional (formal) events, such as LSE, remain the primary method of sharing information between LOs.

KP Connect did engage with ICASA 2015, with funded places for LO staff from TACOSODE, GALZ, and ANS-CI. KP Connect also financed three participants from Côte d’Ivoire (1 ANS-CI staff, 1 leader of an MSM organisation and 1 leader of a SW organisation) to attend a regional meeting in Lomé. Individual, LO and CSO level training events supported by Positive Vibes have taken place on resource mobilisation and organisational development (and support for work plans). Anecdotally, these are appreciated, and are a worthwhile activity, though long-term outcomes and benefits should be tracked at the end of the project.

Other toolkits, such as REAct, are implemented by some LOs. ABS is planning to use REAct more extensively and, in Senegal, this (together with LILO) improved self-esteem amongst KP and (in the case of LiLO) may have had a positive impact on the attitudes towards KP of police attending the training.

Best practices and box office successes

A number of best practices and ‘wins’ are evident for Outcome 3:

- Following the LSE in 2015, ANS-CI developed a new project to target religious leaders.
- The format of the regional meeting is participatory in that the sharing and learning about affected communities and hearing the needs from the ground and driven by countries.
- The LSEs demonstrated that, “Though LOs are at different stages and levels of programming, cross fertilisation can take place, and we can see when people are struggling with an issue. We can learn from other countries.”
- LILO KP has been a key to the success of KP Connect, promoting a much more positive approach to working with LGBTI. Not only related to knowledge but also encouraging a change in organisational thinking. For example: in Senegal, “A police commander comforting a person who had just shared something very emotional. [LiLO] demonstrates something very human that at a basic level we can connect. Working with the community in this way is one of our successes.”

---

89 Discussion, Stay Awake Network Activities (SANA), Tanzania
91 KP Connect Annual Report, 2015
92 KP Connect Annual Report, 2015
93 Discussion, SOPPEKU, Senegal
94 Discussion, Programme Advisor, KANCO
95 Discussion, Grant Manager, Alliance Secretariat
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• Learning and sharing at LSE, and gaining insights from other programmes (e.g. Link Up), and better insights into (for example) SW programming, has been “wonderful.”

• SAT Zambia attended the SW LSE with a representative from the National AIDS Council, providing opportunities for advocacy and knowledge enhancement. Though cited under Outcome 2, this also confirms the strength of the LSE as a mechanism for learning and knowledge sharing.

• Enabling KP organisations to attend LSEs is a special ‘win’ – with (for example) LEGABIBO participating and learning about operating in a criminalised environment. This is also illustrated in the case of GALZ who appreciated the different geographical spaces, seeing how other LOs deal with legal issues.

• Shared information through the LSE on specific topics – the media (CHAU, from guidance shared by BONELA), and documentation (BONELA, who developed a ‘Litigation Guide’).

Challenges, lessons learned
Challenges, and lessons learned, are already evident at this mid-term stage. These are:

• There is a need to follow-up on the impact of the LSE and other learning events – what is the long-term added value? Are they value for money? In particular, ensuring that the meetings are not an end in themselves but a means to an end (so, making relationships work independently of the Alliance Secretariat or KP Connect). This could be incorporated into the annual review, or a most significant change evaluation.

• LO exchanges – aside from the formal events – have been limited. One solution may be to create a website to share reports and best practices, but there are no evident collaborations as yet.

• All LOs and partner organisations have an established way of sharing information that works for them thus it is important to map what these are and then tailor information for these outlets at the country level.

• Learning should be practical, applied, and results oriented.

• Finally, KP Connect has demonstrated that the strength of KP Connect is that activities are driven and shaped by the LO. For example, ANCS chose to involve the police in LILO KP events, based on their cultivation of a positive relationship with them. Potentially confrontational, this was beneficial and rooted in ANCS’s advocacy.

Recommendations

For KP NGOs

• Continue exploring ways to expand knowledge and skills in advocacy and self-empowerment – and be willing to share with other KP organisations’ examples of best practice (either horizontally, or at formal learning events).

For LOs

• Programmes are generally addressing core KP issues, and the successful methodologies of KP Connect could be replicated with groups not currently represented strongly, such as lesbians, and younger adolescents, or those living in rural areas.

• Continue to explore ways to embed the learning gathered through KP Connect into other aspects of LO work focusing on KP.

96 Discussion, ED, CHAU
97 Skype Interview, SAT Zambia
98 Discussion, CEO, BONELA
99 Discussion, GALZ
100 Discussion, Programme Manager, CHAU
101 Discussion, Grants Manager, Alliance Secretariat
For KP Connect team

- Consider developing, with the LOs, a robust exchange programme between LOs – this will encourage horizontal learning outside of formal meetings.
- Explore ways to maximise the learning across the KP Connect network, using creative media for example.
- Continue the support and close engagement with LOs of the regional Advisors – perhaps expanding this into a mentorship role.
- Consider methodologies for M&E of long term impact of learning and knowledge sharing – this could include tracking examples of change (using the most significant change approach).
4. Reflections and conclusion

This review has found evidence of successes, plus challenges and lessons learnt, highlighting what KP Connect has achieved so far and suggesting ways forward over the next 18 months. This section will discuss points in relation to the programme itself, and, more broadly, southern leadership.

On the programme

First, it seems obvious that under KP Connect LOs have been able to identify the best use of technical assistance. The à la Carte approach provides the flexible response to LO needs, agendas, goals, and priorities. LOs refined and enhanced their commitment to KP-focused work, and, especially for those already having a strong KP agenda, strengthened their leadership role, becoming a significant component of the KP ‘voice’ at country level.

Community leaders and agencies, such as religious leaders and law enforcement officers, have been targeted successfully to make a real difference in KP experience. These best practices illustrate that changes can happen when a collaborative and participative approach is initiated within the region. By supporting the opportunity for increased southern leadership and cooperation, KP Connect contributes to the development of national leadership around KP issues.

In terms of progress towards Outcome 1, this review suggests that KP Connect has provided space, time, resources, and expertise to LOs, allowing them to examine their organisation and managerial structure, goals, and strategies. LILO KP and REAct have exposed more individuals and organisations to KP realities and there is evidence of closer engagement as a result. A strong base for further KP Connect implementation has been established (especially in Outcome 2), though it is recommended that outcomes of capacity building should be tracked to obtain a clear picture of skill improvements (i.e. stronger sustainability, or grant application success).

Regarding Outcome 2, there are pockets of success as different countries engage with policymakers, but there is room for developing a deeper focus. This is recognised by the KP Connect team and, as already discussed, a strategy is being developed to strengthen this important outcome, which has the potential to unlock solutions to barriers that KP face. In discussion, we found that LOs have a vision of what needs to happen, and KP Connect is therefore ideally placed to provide ideas and structure on how best to engage policymakers. There should, however, be cognisance of project risk, given the difficult and febrile context of KP policy advocacy.

Progress towards Outcome 3 is also evident. Mechanisms are in place and the variety of approaches has delivered positive outcomes around LO and KP NGO capacity building and learning. However, there is a need to promote more collaboration between LOs, and monitor the long-term impact of learning, especially in improving the support and involvement of KP, and (if relevant) improving access to health and services. One approach might include developing a mentorship scheme to complement the accompaniment approach, led by the Programme Advisors and promoting information exchange and collaborations between LOs and KP NGOs. In addition, an exchange programme may be useful, and has been successful in other Alliance projects.

There is also the continuing need to fully articulate what KP Connect is ‘all about’ – what it aims to achieve and what it can’t. The perception of KP Connect as a stand-alone project operating at a local level also needs to be addressed. One way of achieving these objectives is to continue seeking strategies for effective information dissemination.

On Southern Leadership

Finally, the place of KP Connect in the emergent ‘southern leadership’. The view of the review team is that KP Connect offers a useful mechanism signposting an emerging phenomenon – the shift of
regional programme management from the north to the south. There are other indications that there is a regional network emerging such as structures already present in 2015 (regional Technical Support Hubs in West and Eastern Africa) and relatively recent (Centres of Practice in Senegal and Cape Town).

For KP Connect, the remaining 18 months offer an opportunity to further develop and amplify the regional location of programme leadership and management. For illustration, the discussion of KP Connect’s Outcome 2 above (increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues by the end of 2017 in at least 6 countries) suggested this outcome is yet to be full realised. Discussions during the Validation Meeting confirmed that significant focus would be on this outcome from this point onwards, and as an example of regional support the Alliance Centre (Cape Town) will be cooperating with the KP Connect team to build advocacy capacity and support advocacy efforts at national level in some countries. They will link this to their other work on building regional advocacy capacity and leadership. In addition, at the national level, it has been proposed that the Alliance Centre will work with KP Connect in two countries during 2016 (Tanzania and Uganda) and then, based on this experience, widen their efforts in 2017.102 These initiatives illustrate that KP Connect is well placed to lead on, and be part of, southern-based initiatives.

In addition to KP Connect, there are other initiatives led from the region confirm this emergent network. For example:

- KANCO-led regional harm reduction GF-funded project for East Africa
- ANCS-led regional harm reduction GF-funded project for West Africa
- A Positive Vibes-led regional LGBTI rights work in Southern Africa
- Positive Vibes holding the key capacity building component in KP-Reach, which is a GF-funded regional project in Southern Africa supporting KP regional networks (for example AMSHER, CAL, and ASWA).
- An initiative facilitated by the two Centres of Practice bringing together all African LOs to develop joint regional level advocacy work.

These five initiatives are nascent but growing, and require coordination, exchange, cooperation, and alignment with KP Connect’s LO work, foundational work by the LOs, and Alliance Secretariat-led regional work. Taken together, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that there is a substantive shift in the IHHA Secretariat’s work, and types of engagement, in Africa. This is consistent with statements from the Secretariat recently confirming the need for a commitment to Southern Leadership.103

5. Recommendations

For KP NGOs

- Where possible, provide details of impact at the community level of interventions, especially (if this is attributable) those supported by LOs through KP Connect.
- Don’t be hesitant in communicating with LOs – and the KP Connect team if a line of communication is available (or create one) – for specific areas of technical support that would improve the work with KPs.
- Continue exploring ways to expand knowledge and skills in advocacy and self-empowerment – and be willing to share with other KP NGOs examples of best practice (either horizontally, or at formal learning events).

102 Source: KP Connect Team, ‘KP Connect Outcome 2: The Way Forward’ (8 July 2016)
For LOs

- Be explicit in operationalising planned activities, and be creative in allowing KP Connect to nurture other KP-associated programmes.
- Ensure that whichever reporting mechanisms are in place are rich and detailed enough to enable constructive and developmental feedback on progress, and appropriate recommendations.
- For the LOs implementing regional programmes, explore ways to integrate the benefits of KP Connect into new programming.
- Programmes are generally addressing core KP issues, and the successful methodologies of KP Connect could be replicated with groups not currently represented strongly, such as lesbians, and younger adolescents, or those living in more rural areas.
- Continue to explore ways to embed the learning gathered through KP Connect into other aspects of LO work that focuses on KP.
- The LOs require clear communication strategies that complement their government engagement advocacy initiatives.
- Strengthen partnerships through formal agreements and pursue funding opportunities as consortia.

For KP Connect team

- Explore mechanisms for tracking ‘pathways of influence’ from learning and sharing through to the impact on communities.
- Current funding mechanisms (and fund availability) are flagged by many LOs as an issue of concern – ensure that communication and information available for LOs is explicit and responsibilities are clearly defined.
- The management unit approach does reflect the core nature of the ARP programme, with programmes driven from the LO level. However LOs will require regular, consistent, and strategic technical support to ensure they capitalise on what KP Connect has to offer through the Programme Advisors.
- Consider developing, with the LOs, a robust exchange programme of personnel between LOs – this will encourage horizontal learning outside of the formal meetings.
- Explore ways to maximise the learning across the KP Connect network, using creative media for example.
- Continue the support and close engagement with LOs of the regional Advisors – perhaps expanding this into a mentorship role.
- Consider methodologies for M&E of long term impact of learning and knowledge sharing – this could include tracking examples of change (using the most significant change approach).

Top recommendations

LO level

1. Create a virtual network/email/listserv group to link together the LOs. The network could provide opportunities to share reports, experiences, lessons learned and best practices, organise tele-conference/webinar on key specific issues, and could provide key information from outside (e.g. upcoming regional/international conferences, articles). These should be extensive to accommodate all LOS but be tailored to what is effective at the national level.
2. LOs would benefit from training, and tools, for communicating with the media, especially how to sensitise them to HIV and KP issues. This would promote their involvement in addressing HIV in a mutually beneficial manner.

---

1. This could include listservs already in place, such as the Communities of Practice at the Alliance.
3. As part of the emphasis on Outcome 2, consider inviting government representatives to LO learning and sharing event (or similar) this should facilitate advocacy efforts at the national level.\textsuperscript{105}

**KP Connect team**

4. Explore mechanisms for tracking ‘pathways of influence’ from learning and sharing through to the impact on communities.

5. Funding mechanisms (and fund availability) are flagged by many LOs as an issue of concern – ensure that communication and information available for LOs is explicit and the role and place of KP Connect is clearly defined.

6. The management unit approach does reflect the core nature of the ARP programme, with programmes driven from the LO level. However, LOs will require regular, consistent, and strategic technical support to ensure they capitalise on what KP Connect has to offer.

7. Consider working with LOs to develop specific outcomes associated with changes expected – perhaps using a theory of change? This would ‘ground’ KP Connect and make it more ‘overt’.

8. Develop an M&E tool to capture technical assistance long-term benefits in order to document successes and weaknesses of the long-term accompaniment strategy. Long-term benefits of exchange and learning events should be also carefully evaluated.

Finally, the most significant change would be a useful approach to measure KP Connect’s impact at the end of the project.

\textsuperscript{105} This fits especially well with planned activities around Outcome 2, 2016-2017
Appendices

Appendix 1: Brief Country Summaries

Botswana

Strengths

- KP Connect managed to help BONELA restructure and stabilise by providing much needed organisational development (OD) to support a change process. The OD support helped BONELA to figure out the problems such as resource mobilisation and commit to address them.
- The support rendered by the KP Connect Regional Advisor and the Alliance has helped prime the organisation for a bigger role in the Botswana KP sector.
- The emergence of organisations dealing with KP issues in Botswana has given a face to issues that BONELA is fighting and therefore legitimises issues and gives KPs a face when engaging the conservative Botswana government.
- The LEGABIBO registration case has opened an opportunity for other organisations to register and fight for KP issues legitimately.
- BONELA has developed a method of successfully incubating other organisations to deliver services to KPs.
- A human rights based approach coupled with relentless evidence based litigation has been identified and proven to work where the government has been infringing on the rights of KPs.

Key box office successes

- OD expert was provided and BONELA focused on developing a new strategic plan and resource mobilisation strategy. With support from KP Connect BONELA has managed to strategise and develop a new organisational identity and clarity on what they can do and what their partners can do in the context of delivering KP services in Botswana. The strategic planning and rebranding of BONELA also solicited input from partner organisation and the government through NACA.
- During the period under review BONELA supported a local councillor (a women’s rights advocate) to table a motion on KP issues within council, which was passed. This was a monumental achievement, given Botswana’s conservative approach to discussing KP issues openly. This particular achievement was possible because of the efficient collation of evidence, a mobilised community (KP organisations, the church, and media) and the support of senior politicians (including a former president of Botswana). Even though the councillor faced resistance from sections of society there are plans to mobilise councillors from other local governments to table similar motions as part of advocacy efforts. This is likely to pressure government to do more for KPs.

Weaknesses

- There is no government engagement plan to guide advocacy efforts of the LO and KP NGOs. At present organisations advocating for on behalf of KP have no technical capacity to offer durable solutions to government.
- BONELA is viewed as militant, and this limits meaningful interaction with partners and government.
- BONELA is struggling to manage its own internal affairs due to staffing shortages.

Challenges

- It is difficult to work with the government - it is closed, secretive, and sensitive to criticism.
- There is a general lack of political will to make decisions on demands from different organisations on behalf of KPs in Botswana.
- Partners still do not understand their role in the KP movement within Botswana, resulting in competition between organisation for funding and legitimacy.
- There is much government suspicion of CSOs on KP issues from the government, which believes that it is not a home grown problem.

**Recommendations**

**KP NGOs Level**
- KP Connect is reaping benefits, but still needs to focus strategically on including KP NGOs (and finances) in its work at country levels.
- Strengthen leadership and self-esteem skills amongst KP NGOs - many are relatively inexperienced and a young age.
- Reduce competition among KP organisations through building consortiums to bid for funds and sharing funds equitably in the consortium.

**LO Level**
- BONELA to prioritise OD as a skill, with a specialist in place for focus. This will help strengthen organisational systems. BONELA can position its core staff to align with specific programmes to synchronise with available skill sets.
- There is a need to start an inclusive campaign for decriminalisation of KP work to help people and likeminded organisations to understand how to critique legislation and solicit government allies.
- BONELA needs to develop a government engagement and advocacy strategy targeting high-level decision makers.
- BONELA has been incubating organisations, but needs to develop a plan for the exit of these organisations from their BONELA’s structures.
- KP is a big part of BONELA’s work but there is no focal person for KP - this would help organisational clarity and direction.

**KP Connect team**
- LILO KP has been successful but may benefit from ToTs for rollout at the national level.
- Packaging experiences in advocacy for KPs and how that can be used to help other organisations.
- Documentation of good practices for information sharing at national and regional levels.

**Burundi**

**Strengths**
- KP Connect contributes to create a positive environment to work with KPs. The project strengthens organisations capacities including leadership skills.
- KP Connect provides in a very efficient manner technical and organisational assistance to the LOs and their partners
- KPs have already gained a better visibility and KP NGOs are now better organised. Two KPs are now part of the Global Fund CCM, and one KP is now part of ABS staff and board committee.
- Activities to reduce stigma and discrimination (S&D) against KPs as well as advocacy activities (LILO, REAact) have been identified as very powerful tools to fill out some gaps and respond to urgent needs. They are high expectations with REAct and KPs are looking forward the implementation process to document human right violations with regards to access to health and KPs.

**Key box office successes**
- **LILO**: LILO KP workshop has been identified as a key activity for the LO board members as well as LO staff. This training also played a great role in building leadership skills amongst KPs. It focused on human rights in order to improve knowledge of existing laws and sensitise people on KP issues. New targets have been already identified (i.e. law enforcements (police), health care providers and people involved with laws).

- **REAct**: People are looking forward using REAct so a close follow-up should be done with the LO in order to avoid loss of enthusiasm amongst the KPs.

- **Learning and Sharing Event (LSE)** are perceived as a key activity to learn from others at regional levels and then rollout evidence-based interventions in country.

**Weaknesses**

- Some KP NGOs are not strong enough. It seems that there are still some capacity building needs such as: leadership, advocacy, lobbying. This will help to make NGOs autonomous\(^\text{106}\). LILO approach might cover the need over time.

- KP Connect appears as a pertinent project but some interviewees mentioned the lack of funds (especially when it comes to purchasing basic work related needs such as bond paper)\(^\text{107}\) as a brake when implementing the project.

**Challenges**

- KP Connect was not really connected to the model project in the sense that it was not a logical follow-up to the PPTCT model project targeting pregnant woman and their partners.

- There was a delay in implementation due to the political context but positive impacts are beginning to emerge (better visibility of KP and stronger participatory approach with KP as they are now part of key stakeholder and decision makers).

**Recommendations**

**KP NGO level**

- Strengthen leadership and self-esteem skills amongst KP NGOs using LILO Identity as it is a good tool to respond to those needs.

**KPC Team and LO level**

- Create a regional virtual network/email group to link together the LOs. The network could provide opportunities to share reports, experiences, lessons learned and best practices, organise tele-conference/webinar on key specific issues, and could also provide key information from outside (i.e. upcoming regional/international conferences, and articles). Existing mechanism might need to be better promoted amongst the LOs (for example the Alliance intranet).

**KP Connect team level**

- Identify a small budget for LOs to implement activities on the ground and respond to basic material needs of some NGOs.

- Finally, the most significant change should be a powerful approach to measure KP Connect’s impact at the end of the project.

**Côte d'Ivoire**

**Strengths**

- KP Connect provides in a very efficient manner technical and organisational assistance to LOs and its KP NGOs.

----

\(^{106}\) ABS, Director, May 2016, Skype call interview.

\(^{107}\) ABS, Director, May 2016, Skype call interview.
• Existence of a successful triangle partnerships within the programme that is effective communication with local NGOs and KP Connect, the Alliance Secretariat is always present to provide technical assistance as needed, and ANSCI works in close collaboration with the National AIDS Committee (Programme National de Lutte contre le Sida).

• ANSCI is seen as a key organisation to work with KPs at both national and regional levels, the LO is in a strong position to address KP challenges in Côte d’Ivoire (i.e. MSM, and SW).

• Activities to reduce stigma against KPs as well as advocacy activities (LILLO, REAct) have been identified as very powerful tools to fill out some gaps and respond to urgent needs.

Key box office successes

• **KP NGOs network:** The federation of KP NGOs has been identified as a major step to make KP voices heard, stronger and even deeper content-based in the country. KP NGOs are all together to achieve a common vision and goals but keep their sovereignty. Through the network, the KP NGOs are putting together technical skills, tools and energy in order to harmonise the response to the HIV epidemic.

• **LILLO:** LILLO KP training has been mentioned as a key activity for both LO committee members as well as KPs. New learnings have already impacted positively some behaviours and pratices within the organisation. This training also played a great role in building leadership skills amongst KPs. New targets have been identified (i.e. law enforcement, religious leaders, and health care professional in rural areas).

• **Partnership with religious leaders:** This evidence-based intervention taking place in IC is a double success as it is coming from a learning and exchange event with other LOs and is already successful in IC. The religious leaders who attended the first meeting realised they have a role to play. “They made some commitments to get a little bit more involved in the fight against HIV in general, but also to consider KP as a key target population.”108

Weaknesses

• Validation of the 2015 workplan was far too late (Oct-Nov 2015).

• Lack of funding (even small) to undertake activities and/or fund KP NGOs.
  - Some NGOs are still missing basic material/items (computer) to work more efficiently.
  - In addition, the lack of KP NGO funding reduces the M&E activities amongst them: it is difficult to ask for reporting/accountability when no fund is provided.

• KP NGOs appears not strong enough to stand up in such difficult context. Activities focusing on building self-esteem and leadership are highly recommended.

Challenges

• Leadership issues or a sense of competitions amongst KP organisations might have jeopardised the KP creation of a network and might still have negative impact.

• There is a general lack of resources at the national HIV/AIDS committee level.

Recommendations

**KP NGO level**

• Strengthen leadership and self-esteem skills amongst KP NGOs. Targeting SW might still be challenging as they are highly hidden. LILLO Identity should be an adequate tool to respond to the current needs.

• Build managerial and resources mobilisation skills amongst NGOs.

• Identify a small budget to implement activities on the ground and respond to basic material needs of some NGOs.

---

108 ANSCI, KP Coordinator, May 2016, most significant change story, self-written.
KPC Team and LO level

- Create a regional virtual network/email group to link together the LOs. The network could provide opportunities to share reports, experiences, lessons learned and best practices, organise tele-conference/webinar on key specific issues, and could also provide key information from outside (i.e. upcoming regional/international conferences, articles). Existing mechanism might need to be better promoted amongst the LOs (i.e. Alliance intranet).

KP Connect team level

- Invite government representatives to attend the learning and sharing events together with the LOs and KP organisations. This could be an opportunity where stakeholders can share evidence-based interventions, experiences, lessons learned, and good practices with key decision-makers. This facilitates advocacy efforts at the national level.
- Facilitate with the PNLS the technical and organisational capacities evaluation of the KP NGOs in order to facilitate a better coordination of the KP interventions.\(^{109}\)
- Design and implement activities with media to address in a coherent manner the KP situation (i.e. a training to work in better collaboration with the media focusing on how to sensitise them better and work better with them).
- Monitor and evaluate advocacy events/workshops by working in close collaboration with key representatives of the target populations (i.e. law enforcement, ministry representative) over time in order to measure impact and identify potential challenges and barriers.

Kenya

Strengths

- KANCO is in a strong position to work with KPs and already engaged with national policymakers.
- KANCO includes innovative programmes to support KP, including M-Health and M-Clinic – has much to share with other LOs about this and other creative approaches.
- KANCO is transitioning to a regional approach, and is poised to utilise gains from KP Connect to help other NGOs have a broader perspective on supporting KP at country levels.
- KANCO has strong technical capacity to deliver training and develop strategies, and has effective relationship with local partners.
- KANCO is well placed to work with PUD.

Key box office successes

- LILO is in the process of being integrated into KP programming and KANCO is supporting the implementation with local partners as well as deepening its own knowledge of KP.
- KANCO is engaging with national policymakers and key stakeholders, ‘connecting’ them with KP Connect’s activities (LSE, and LILO) where possible.
- Sharing details of M-Health and M-Clinic initiatives with KP Connect LOs at one LSE – and is keen to explore other creative social media platforms.

Key challenges

- Continue – strategically – rolling out both LILO programmes with partners.
- Working in a hostile environment does pose difficulties and developments require careful planning and caution to make progress.
- Attendance at KP Connect LSE, though beneficial, requires flexibility and funding – are there additional ways to share information?

Recommendations

\(^{109}\) This process has been initiated by the PNLS but no more funding is available.
• KANCO has strong technical ability and a well-established partner network thus KP Connect can be utilised to continue rolling out LILO, and supporting partners to develop further strategic approaches to supporting KP.
• The momentum from developments – especially LILO - so far should be maintained.
• Explore – with KP Connect and/or other LOs who are keen – developing additional tools for sharing examples of best practice in supporting KP, especially in the transition to a regional focus.
• Consider exploring – with KP Connect/Positive Vibes - methodologies for tracking the long-term impact of KP Connect so far – what changes have emerged that are attributable to the programme? How has KP Connect affected other programmes?

Senegal
Strengths
• KP Connect has the potential to respond to some critical needs by building LO and NGOs capacities. This step remains a key to produce stronger organisations. KP Connect helps to increase responsibility amongst KPs that will bring more positive outcomes.
• ANCS is seen as an important KP organisation, and is in a strong position to address KP challenges in Senegal and the region. The relation between the LO and local NGOs is effective, and based on trust and confidence. There is a high level of demands/need for technical support, and ANCS is ready to take on the challenge of building NGO capacity at both national and regional levels.
• ANCS is very open to KP.
• Activities to reduce stigma, and advocacy activities (LILO, REAct), are powerful tools to fill gaps and respond to urgent need.

Key box office successes
• LILO: LILO KP has identified as a key activity for both LO board members and KPs. It played a significant role in building KP leadership skills. New targets have been already identified, and include allied health staff (security guards, administrative staff, nurses, pharmacists, and cleaning staff). This will be vital for addressing stigma and discrimination.
• REAct: the training improved self-esteem amongst KPs and changed negative behaviour from the police representatives. Before REAct, KPs did not have a full picture and in-depth understanding of their own rights. Now they their rights and are in a better position to denounce violations and what to do when it happens. REAct has also a very positive impact on the police. Before REAct, there were a lot of violations towards SW (racketeering, and sexual abuse). Now, the police have received advocacy sessions about human rights and are now more sensitised. They also identified a police focal point.110
• Learning and Sharing Event in South Africa (July 2015): KPs highly appreciated the exchange event, they have learned a lot, especially the NGOs working on human rights.

Weaknesses
• One member of ANCS mentioned he does not feel the collaboration with PV maybe because of linguistic barriers. In addition, there is a perceived lack of clear guidelines on roles and responsibilities of PV within KP Connect team.
• At LO level, there is a need to improve monitoring and follow-up with beneficiaries (KP organisations) to have a better idea of the technical assistance (TA) long-term benefits.

Emergent Needs
• Ongoing training for peer educators

110 Program Assistant, ANCS, May 25 2016, Skype call interview.
• ANCS need financial assistance to maintain the sharing of experiences and good practices with partners in the region.\textsuperscript{111}

Recommendations

KP NGOs level

• Continue to develop managerial skills, resource mobilisation, and advocacy.

LOs level

• Improve communication within ANCS staff and ensure there is a full understanding of PV roles and responsibilities under KP Connect. All ANCS staff should be clear on the expectations and outcomes of PV within the KPC project.
• Reinforce the communication with PV and identify the roles and responsibilities of both PV and ANCS. This could be done by defining more clearly the extent of the technical assistance provided by PV and more importantly identify ways of better collaboration in order to achieve common goals.

KPC Team level

• Finally, the most significant change should be a powerful approach to measure the impact of KP Connect at the end of the project.

Tanzania

Strengths

• TASOCODE is in a strong position to work with KPs, and through KP Connect has strengthened and enriched its focus on KP work within the organisation and among partners – TASOCODE is keen to learn and strengthen its KP related work within Tanzania.
• TASOCODE has increased technical capacity, and has marked enthusiasm for expanding KP work – including developing a strong KP strategy and a resource mobilisation strategy.
• Evidence suggests TASOCODE has transitioned from SHARP into KP Connect smoothly and effectively – taking developments from the former to inform and develop the latter.
• TASOCODE have made progress in working alongside TACAIDS (and other official stakeholders) – including sensitising them to KP issues. They are now being perceived as a strong KP-focused organisation and now participate in national-level planning meetings.

Key box office successes

• LILO is being integrated into KP programming, impacting on the ‘thinking’ of TACOSODE as an organisation, and on the knowledge capacity and self-awareness of IP.
• Development of a robust KP strategy and being seen as the key ‘go to’ organisation for KP programming in Tanzania [the Executive Director is a commissioner at TACAIDS].
• Sensitisation meetings with government and other national-level stakeholders – short-term evidence of attitude change (illustrated in the most significant change story below) and there is significant value in the sharing of KP testimonies at these events.

Key challenges

• Working with the media is an ongoing difficulty especially around S&D of KP, and the language of national policymakers can run counter to best practice for promoting the health and well being of KP. Persistence and consistency are likely to be fruitful.

\textsuperscript{111} ANCS, Program Assistant, May 2016, Written interview.
• KP Connect is in part perceived as ‘separate’ in some ways. Care must be taken to ensure momentum continues and the benefits of KP Connect are maximised across the programme landscape.
• Resource capacity of partner KP organisations does vary, and TASOCODE has to think strategically about the rolling out of the LILO programme and other KP-focused support and tools. In addition, KP data are limited in Tanzania [acknowledged by TACAIDS]
• Currently there is limited engagement with parliamentarians (by TACOSODE, or partner KP organisations); in addition, national level sensitisation meetings are at times limited to ‘middle ranking’ individuals – reaching the higher levels of decision makers is still required.

Recommendations
• Continue to strive and shape the message – TASOCODE is well placed to ensure support for KP is prominent and more effective, but attitudinal and policy barriers are a constant threat.
• KP Connect and the LO can explore ways – alongside TACAIDS – to gather information on KPs in Tanzania that could include additional vulnerable groups often missed in policy, such as lesbians, those living in rural areas, and adolescents (aged 10-16).
• TASOCODE needs to ensure initial support for KP organisations is strategic and targeted to ensure maximum benefit; and develop (simple) tools to monitor impact.
• The LO to ensure support for partner KP organisations is also consistent – following initial interventions, what long-term capacity challenges emerge? How can benefits be sustained?

Uganda
Strengths
• CHAU is in a strong position to work with KPs, has knowledge capacity, and is closely involved in national level HIV-related events, such as 16 Days of Activism, and hosting foreign parliamentarians (in this case, the UK International Development Secretary).
• KP Connect has enabled CHAU to achieve national accreditation and they are in a robust position to operationalize their advocacy and communications strategy, raising their profile at the national level.
• There is evidence CHAU is capitalising on elements of KP Connect to expand their KP programming and resource mobilisation – suggesting enthusiasm and keenness to learn and grow as a KP-focused organisation, and explore ways to maximise progress.

Key box office successes
• Internally, CHAU has utilised KP Connect (and especially LILO) to enrich its thinking about KP, and evidence suggests this has impacted on the organisation’s governance in a positive way.
• CHAU is working hard to establish stronger connections with the Ministry of Health and Uganda AIDS Control programme and are moving towards establish KP focal points; in addition, and assisted by events such as a CHAU-convened policy dialogue, the LO is involved in developing national level indicators (though this is work in progress, and dependent on political stability).
• KP programming has expanded to include a stronger focus on SW, and KP connect has impacted on key learning related to media reporting around SW (and in particular male SW) and MSM. Documentation and media engagement is now more robust – there is stronger awareness of the need to disseminate information through various media and CHAU have steered articles to publication in newspapers.

Key challenges
• Working through KP Connect with other CSOs at this stage is limited– as yet an organised event has not been arranged.
• Though LILO has been of significant benefit to some this has not yet been rolled out throughout CHAU.
• For its KP work, CHAU does work in a hostile environment and legislative shifts (real, or anticipated) create significant barriers to progress.
• CHAU is at a challenging stage, transitioning between core projects (Link UP and SHARP both coming to an end) and exploring avenues for further KP-focused work. A recent grant (from SIDA) offers a unique opportunity to significantly scale up KP Connect’s support for CHAU and this may potentially make a huge difference.\(^{112}\)

**Recommendations**

• Strategic planning for the remaining part of KP Connect should reflect available funding, and work to clarify the shape and contribution of KP Connect in existing and planned programmes for LOs.
• Ensure that LILO is utilised as widely as possible, within CHAU and with partner NGOs.
• Consider stronger engagement with parliamentarians, capitalising on CHAU’s existing reputation and connections with other government agencies.
• Continue working with national level agencies to promote a KP-friendly policy agenda, drawing on CHAU’s reputational strength.

**Zambia**

**Strengths**

• Participation in KP Connect has enabled SAT Zambia to gain a deeper insight into LGBTI issues and implement activities, engage like-minded organisations, develop an understanding of broader KP issues, and programme more holistically.
• LILO and the learning and sharing events have broadened SAT Zambia’s understanding of SW and the engagement of LGBTI. They provided networking and reference material for SW and LGBTI programming.
• With support from KP Connect, SAT Zambia conducted a rapid assessment of the SW programme, and broadened the age group for SW targeted by the programme.
• Engaging parliament without animosity was a key achievement, using evidence and diplomacy.
• Knowledge and skills have improved around LGBTI programming at a national level in Zambia. SAT Zambia sits on the NSP review team and will ensure KP issues are prioritised.
• The packaging of LILO KP training is beneficial, helping SAT Zambia engage the National AIDS Council more effectively (officials have attended the training).
• SAT Zambia is now recognised at a national level around LGBTI issues.

**Key box office successes**

• KP Connect has supported the development of SAT Zambia’s documentation of the SW model.
• Engaging with policymakers and to have their buy in has been a major achievement (though this still needs to be more effective at the community level).
• SAT Zambia included a high level official (responsible for the NSP review) in the LSE covering sex work issues in 2016. This helped to engage allies, and will (hopefully) be reflected in the review.

**Weaknesses**

• There is little local evidence collected so far to support advocacy initiatives.

---

\(^{112}\) The reviewers acknowledge that KP Connect has been supporting CHAU during and after the grant application process, illustrating the investment KP Connect project makes before an organisation confirms new KP project funding. It is a high risk, but high gains approach implicit in the KP Connect model.
- There is no specific funding for staff working on KP Connect.
- Funding may be required to enable SAT Zambia to provide OD with LGBTI organisations that request support for policy and strategic issues.

**Challenges**
- Staffing issues resulted in difficulties in time allocated to the programme.
- Delay in signing agreement/contract for 2016.

**Recommendations**
- SAT Zambia can consider expanding resource mobilisation beyond the programme to enable service delivery to KPs and organisations that represent them.
- KP Connect can consider funding for a dedicated member of staff for KP would be great for programming and advocacy. At the moment it’s an added event and burden even though the programme is benefitting the organisation.

**Zimbabwe**

**Strengths**
- Capacity building for staff and mentorship to address internal management systems has helped strengthen the internal and external systems for the organisation.
- KP Connect helped on advocacy initiatives, evidence, and tools that they can use to deliver mandate for KPs. This helped GALZ learn about how to address LGBTI issues at both national and regional level, solidifying the role of GALZ as the leading KP organisation in Zimbabwe. GALZ also take advocacy beyond Zimbabwe to the region.
- LSEs enabled GALZ to learn from others about best practices in human rights, SRHR, and HIV programming. It also helped appreciate different geographical spaces and challenges they face; how others are addressing legal issues e.g. litigation, service provision, media, and KP service delivery.
- Relationship and constant interaction with the KP Connect regional Advisor has benefited GALZ’s work.

**Box Office successes**
- KP LILO training with civil society organisations in 2015 for engaging with KP issues during ICASA 2015.
- A mentoring and coaching system for effective programming.
- LILO KP has helped GALZ beyond KP connect, for example Global Fund work.

**Weaknesses**
- KP Connect is less structured and is partner-led. This has led to some confusion, as the organisation prefers a structured approach to capacity building.
- There is no budget to support staff working on the programme - leading to perceptions KP Connect may be ‘disruptive’.

**Challenges**
- The President has influenced the discourse on homosexuality and this affects engagement of relevant government ministries and politicians.
- Incorrect understanding of the constitution, and law, in Zimbabwe especially around criminalisation.
- Media misinformation on LGBTI issues.
- Geopolitics and suspicion that LGBTI issues are ‘foreign’ to the country
- Negative attitudes from religious leaders, and cultural beliefs, on homosexuality.

**Recommendations**
LO level

- GALZ can explore inviting project-friendly government officials to KP Connect activities to promote engagement in an environment conducive to discussion.
- GALZ needs to be supported with training that focusing on government processes and how to influence these processes, e.g. parliamentary thematic committees.

KP Connect team

- Consider drawing more on local consultants for KP work at the national level.
- KP Connect should consider developing tools to document the impact of events and workshops. This is currently limited.
- KP Connect can consider the certification of partners in Zimbabwe as experts to deliver training (for example, LILO) to maximise capacity building.
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A. Interview guide: LOs

[Biographical data]

1. Introduction

We are undertaking the Mid-term review of the KP connect program and your feedback is important in order to implement the program for the next 18 months. The questions will focus on the achievement to date as well as your perceptions on what works well and what does not work so well so far. Any comments and recommendations are more than welcome.

2. Questions

2.1 Outcomes

OUTCOME 1: First let’s talk about the program first outcome: “Improved technical capacity among civil society organisations to promote KP access to HIV, health and rights services, by end of 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date

- What organisational development (OD) support under KP Connect have you received to date and how has that helped you? (Covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
- What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
- How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
  - Look at the strategic plan, M&E plan, targets and achievements (MRS).

Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories

- How has KP Connect supported your organisation or programme development so far?
- What are the elements of KP Connect under this outcome have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned

- What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
- Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

General comments:

- What form of support do you still require from KP Connect?
- Do you have any additional comment on this first outcome?

OUTCOME 2: Let’s talk first about the second outcome: “In at least 6 countries, the Alliance can demonstrate increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues, by end of 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date

- What are some of the main impediments to government and policymaker engagement on KP issues in this country? How has KP Connect helped you address them?
- How has KP Connect specifically impacted on the way you engage with policymakers in this country?
• What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
• How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?

**Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories**
• What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

**Challenges, Lessons learned**
• What are the elements that have not worked well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
• Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

**General comments**
• Do you have any additional comment on this second outcome?

**OUTCOME 3:** Let’s talk first about the third outcome: “Improved processes for regional knowledge sharing and learning by LOs and KP CSO, by 2017.”

**Implementation/Achievement to date**
• How have you benefitted from KP Connect in terms of improvements in your capacities in knowledge management?
• Has your networking, documentation and information sharing capacity improved under KP Connect? Explain?
• What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
• How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
• Do you share lessons/ ideas etc. with other partners & countries? How have benefited from these exchanges?

**Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories**
• What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

**Challenges, Lessons learned**
• What are the elements that have not worked well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
• Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

**General comments**
• Do you have any additional comment on this last outcome?

2.2 General perspectives

Let’s talk from a general perspective now:

Program management
• Are the initial assumptions that guided the reformulation of KP Connect still valid?
• Do you believe that the program has adequate resources (technical, financial and otherwise)? If so why? How can this be improved?
• What are your comments and perceptions on KP Connect as a whole and what it is trying to achieve?
• Can you comment on the nature of the working relationship with PV and the advisors in the context of KP Connect? Is it working well? Can it be changed/improved?
• How does your office/organisation work with the Positive Vibes and/or the International HIV/AIDS Alliance programmes in terms of communication, supervision and reporting?
• Do the systems and processes used for managing the regional project in terms of communication, supervision and reporting work well? Where are the gaps?
• Do you think that Positive vibes has the capacity to provide technical assistance to the program?
• How effective is the overall programme implementation model and approach for meeting the needs of LOs?
  o How do you think works the communication between Alliance and Positive vibes?
  o How do you think works the communication between the 2 country coordinators (Warren and Sylvie)?
  o How do you think works the communication between Country coordinators and LOs?
  o How do you think works the communication between LOs and Alliance?

Recommendations
• What adjustments could we make to improve the quality and effectiveness of the programme?
• What is the most successful aspect of the programme?
• If you could change one thing about the programme what would that be?
• Do you know if so far the program has had any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) for the KP community? Please explain?

B. Interview guide: implementing partners and partners

[Biographical data]

1. Introduction

We are undertaking the Mid-term review of the KP connect program and your feedback is important in order to implement the program for the next 18 months. The questions will focus on the achievement to date as well as your perceptions on what works well and what does not work so well so far. Any comments and recommendations are more than welcome.

2. Questions

2.1 Outcomes

OUTCOME 1: First let’s talk about the program first outcome: “Improved technical capacity among civil society organisations to promote KP access to HIV, health and rights services, by end of 2017”.

Implementation/Achievement to date
• Has your LO’s capacity improved? And what are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
• How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
  o Look at the strategic plan, M&E plan, targets and achievements (MRS).

Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories
• What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned
• What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
• Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

General comments
• Do you have any additional comment on this first outcome?

OUTCOME 2: Let’s talk first about the second outcome: “In at least 6 countries, the Alliance can demonstrate increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues, by end of 2017”.

Implementation/Achievement to date
• What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
• How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?

Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories
• What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned
• What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
• Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to work with the government/policymakers?

General comments
• Do you have any additional comment on this second outcome?

OUTCOME 3: Let’s talk first about the third outcome: “Improved processes for regional knowledge sharing and learning by LOs and KP CSO, by 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date
• What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
• How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
• Do you share lessons/ ideas etc. with other partners & countries? How have benefited from these exchanges?
Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories
- What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned
- What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
- What other challenges have you faced in knowledge sharing and learning?

General comments
- Do you have any additional comment on this last outcome?

2.2 General perspectives
Let’s talk from a general perspective now:

Program management
- Do you believe that the program has adequate resources (technical, financial and otherwise)? If so why? How can this be improved?
- How does your office/organisation work with the LO in terms of communication, supervision and reporting?

Recommendations
- What adjustments could we make to improve the quality and effectiveness of the programme?
- What is the most successful aspect of the programme?
- If you could change one thing about the programme what would that be?
- Do you know if so far the program has had any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) for the KP community? Please explain?

C. Interview guide: Alliance secretariat and Positives Vibes country coordinators
[Biographical data]

1. Introduction
The questions will focus on the achievement to date as well as your perceptions on what works well and what does not work so well so far. Any comments and recommendations are more than welcome.

2. Questions

2.1 Outcomes

OUTCOME 1: First let’s talk about the program first outcome: “Improved technical capacity among civil society organisations to promote KP access to HIV, health and rights services, by end of 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date
What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
  - Look at the strategic plan, M&E plan, targets and achievements (MRS).

Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories

- What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned

- What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
- Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

General comments

- Do you have any additional comment on this first outcome?

OUTCOME 2: Let’s talk first about the second outcome: “In at least 6 countries, the Alliance can demonstrate increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues, by end of 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date

- What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
- How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?

Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories

- What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned

- What are the elements that have not worked so well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
- Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

General comments

- Do you have any additional comment on this second outcome?

OUTCOME 3: Let’s talk first about the third outcome: “Improved processes for regional knowledge sharing and learning by LOs and KP CSO, by 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date

- What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
- How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
• What are the key achievements to date (covering the period from 2014 to April 2016)?
• How do achievements to date compare with planned progress towards objectives as set out in the log frame?
• Do you share lessons/ ideas etc. with other partners & countries? How have benefited from these exchanges?

Best practices, ‘Box Office Success’ stories

• What are the elements that have worked well so far and what can we learn from these successes going forward?

Challenges, Lessons learned

• What are the elements that have not worked well and what can we learn from these challenges going forward?
• Do you see any other issue, challenge that prevent you and your organisation to implement the work as supposed?

General comments

• Do you have any additional comment on this last outcome?

2.2 General perspectives

Let’s talk from a general perspective now:

Program management

• Are the initial assumptions that guided the reformulation of KP Connect still valid?
• Do you believe that the program has adequate resources (technical, financial and otherwise)? If so why? How can this be improved?
• How does your organisation work with the Alliance ARP/Positive vibes (select the appropriate organisation depends on the interviewee) program in terms of communication, supervision and reporting?
• Do the systems and processes used for managing the regional project in terms of communication, supervision and reporting work well? Where are the gaps?
• Do you think that Positive vibes has the capacity to provide technical assistance to the program?
• How effective is the overall programme implementation model and approach for meeting the needs of LOs?
  o To what extent do the different stakeholders and components operate in a coherent regional manner?
  o How do you think works the communication between Alliance and Positive vibes?
  o How do you think works the communication between the 2 country coordinators (Warren and Sylvie)?
  o How do you think works the communication between Country coordinators and LOs?
  o How do you think works the communication between LOs and Alliance?
• How often do you meet with ARP technical support teams to review activities? What are the challenges/ constraints in terms of reporting?
Recommendations

- What adjustments could we make to improve the quality and effectiveness of the programme?
- What is the most successful aspect of the programme?
- If you could change one thing about the programme what would that be?
- Do you know if so far the program has had any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) for the KP community? Please explain?

D. Interview guide: Government Representatives

[Biographical data]

1. Introduction

We are undertaking the Mid-term review of the KP connect program and your feedback is important in order to implement the program for the next 18 months. The questions will focus the KP situation in the country and your relationship with the LO. The aim of this interview is to understand the context from your perspective so that it can help the LO engage with you and issues better in this country?

2. Questions

- What are some of the challenges that this country faces in addressing the issues of KPs in this country?
  - From your point of view, who are the most vulnerable KPs in this country? Why?
- How would explain the current situation of KPs and HIV in this country?

OUTCOME 2: The second outcome of KP Connect is: “In at least 6 countries, the Alliance can demonstrate increased engagement of national policymakers in KP issues, by end of 2017.”

Implementation/Achievement to date

- How would you characterise the relationship of the government, the LO, and other like-minded organisations in this country?
- What are some of the main impediments to government and policymaker engagement on KP issues in this country?
- How do you plan to address some of the challenges faced by KPs if at all?
- What can be done to enhance and bridge the gap in government and civil society relationship when it comes to KP issues?
- What would be the ideal relationship between the government and civil society organisation that ensures KP issues are addressed for the benefit of all involved?

General comments

- Do you have any comment on what civil society in this country need to do to be able to be heard by the government in this country on KP issues
E. Interview guide: Most significant change

[Biographical data]

Confidentiality

NOTE FOR PARTICIPANT: We will use your views to inform the structure and planning of future projects. We’d like to tell your story in a way you are happy with, and you don’t have to tell us anything you don’t want to, and if necessary, we can change your name.

We might use your words in:
- Leaflets, posters, videos, press, magazines and other publications to show people what we do
- Share them with other organisations we work with

Your answers will be confidential and no names will be written without your permission. You don’t have to answer any question you prefer not to and you can stop the interview at any time. It will take about 45 minutes.

Introduction and question guide

Some community projects are being planned to address important issues around HIV prevention and access to care and services.

The purpose of this interview is to collect comments and stories from people about their experiences and potential changes that might happen since the start of the ARP program. This will make sure current project respond to your needs and views.

- To start with, could you please tell me more about you, your age, where do you live, your position?
- Looking back over the past 18 months, what in your experience are the most significant changes [domain will be selected by the respondent]?
  Probing questions:
  What kind of changes have you noticed?

- Could you please let me know what are the most significant change you have seen in this past one-year and half in this ...(office, program, community, etc.)?
  Probing questions:
  Could you please tell me the story of what happened??
  What were things like before the change?
  Then what happened... what changed?
  Why? Why did the change occur?
  How it occurred /is it still occurring?
  How did people react to this change?
  From your point of view, is this a positive or negative change?
  If you were telling this story of change to an audience, what title would you give it?

- What makes this change important?
Appendix 4: List of Key Informants interviewed for the MTR

All interviews took place during May 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Sylvie Pawele</td>
<td>Positive vibes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren Banks</td>
<td>Positive vibes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cat Simmons</td>
<td>Alliance secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carsten Norgard</td>
<td>Positive Vibes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Jeanne d'Arc Kabanga,</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blaise Mucomwiza,</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mona</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Lucile Konan</td>
<td>CNS - CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tana Yapi</td>
<td>CNS - CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bertine Semi Lou</td>
<td>CNS - CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippe Njaboue</td>
<td>Alternative - CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Dosso</td>
<td>Alternative - CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franck Amani</td>
<td>Espace Confiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sylvie Kouakou</td>
<td>PNLS/PHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dom Abla</td>
<td>PNLS/PHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrice Gnon</td>
<td>PNLS/PHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Hokou</td>
<td>PNLS/PHV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Ousseynou Badio</td>
<td>ANCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leon Michel</td>
<td>ANCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lala Maty Sow</td>
<td>AND SOPPEKUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Bharam Namanya</td>
<td>CHAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodgers Ampwera</td>
<td>CHAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margret Elang</td>
<td>CHAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gracias Atwiine</td>
<td>CHAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Deodat Kayombo</td>
<td>TACOSODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatu Masangula</td>
<td>TACOSODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theofrida Kapinga</td>
<td>TACOSODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Ndunguru</td>
<td>TACOSODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Anthony</td>
<td>TACOSODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophia Lugilah[Awaiting final information]</td>
<td>Waremba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Stay Awake Network Activities (SANA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Kaganda</td>
<td>TACAIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Engira</td>
<td>TACAIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audrey Njelekela</td>
<td>TACAIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Victor Shaban[Awaiting final information]</td>
<td>Men Against AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Kamua[Deputy Director]</td>
<td>KANCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Wall[Programme Advisor]</td>
<td>KANCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Cindy Kelemi</td>
<td>BONELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felistus Motimedi</td>
<td>BONELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodgers Bande</td>
<td>BONELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Mathambo</td>
<td>Pilot Mathambo Centre for Men's Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Chalmers</td>
<td>LEGABIBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Muzila</td>
<td>NACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Bonolo Dinokopila</td>
<td>BONELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thatayotle Molefe</td>
<td>Men for Health and Gender Justice Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sergant Kgosietesile</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Chester Samba</td>
<td>GALZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Matsikure</td>
<td>GALZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Zoonadi Ngwenya</td>
<td>SAT Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Silukena</td>
<td>SAT Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Validation Meeting agenda and findings summary

[See accompanying document, ‘KP Connect Mid Term Review: Validation Meeting_160701’]
Appendix 6: ARP 3 Phase 1 Evaluation

[See accompanying document]