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Introduction

The annual KP Connect / East Africa Programmes review meeting was designed to open up learnings within and between teams through a series of conversations about practice and design. Conversation is different from debate or discussion as it aims to link and build in order to make new knowledge and generate ideas together.

The process included an update from two programmes (KP Connect and East Africa) to kick start the conversations and generate critical themes for deeper exploration, before moving into more operational discussions about Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and future programming within KP Connect.

Programme

The following programme was broadly followed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme – Day 1 16 January 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 Getting connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 Programme review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa Programmes (Tanzania &amp; Uganda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 Revising design for remainder of the Learning Event / articulating themes for the conversation to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 Learning from practice and content: exploring some themes in conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 Review &amp; Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme – Day 2 17 January 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 Reconnecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 Learning from practice and content: exploring some themes in conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 Synthesis/further processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 Learning and M&amp;E processes for the remainder of KP Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 Potential new programmes naturally growing out of KP Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 Review &amp; Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsten Norgaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvie Pawele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Horsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pernille Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonella Virga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavian Rhode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Mondry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salen Kambinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Janse Van Rensburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting connected**

In order to get connected, participants were asked to reflect on where they are at now, the year behind and the year ahead. There were some core commonalities amongst the group including experiences of change and transition; the need for more work-life balance, boundaries and timeout; the desire to be more conscious, purposeful, and present in order to have clarity and stillness; and an orientation towards more reflective, strategic, focused and learning-oriented approaches to work in the coming year.

Participants then surfaced a number of **questions** and **expectations** for the event, including:

- So what?
- What is enough?
- What works and what doesn’t work? What are the synergies across programmes? How can we work together better?
- What are the core principles and learnings for programming that we can extract from these experiences?
- How do we disseminate lessons / practices to other programmes?
- How do we manage the tensions between expansion and consolidation?
- What are the dynamics of influencing?
- What is the most viable model for the Alliance to do KP work?
- How do we help others do relationships better?
- How do we finish strong?
Programme review

Two programmes (East Africa and KP Connect) were presented to allow for some surfacing of experiences, which would then serve as the foundation for learning from practice and content. The two programs presented were quite different, allowing for a wide range of experiences to feed into conversations. A notable difference between the two programmes was that the East Africa programme works directly with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) organisations and individuals in Tanzania and Uganda; whilst KP Connect works at national intermediary and regional level with a focus on key populations (Men who have Sex with Men [MSM], Transgender, sex workers and People Who Use Drugs [PWUDs]).

East Africa programmes

Presentation summary

Anita Simon, Programme Lead on the East Africa Programmes provided a brief overview of the Tanzania and Uganda projects to date, including findings from the 2016 Mid-Term Review, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanzania Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Reduce minority stress / self stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Build organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Societal stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Safety and security &amp; research (cross cutting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Implemented by PV &amp; LGBT Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ 2015 – 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ 5 In-country partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Funded by CSU Denmark &amp; Obel Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Implemented in Dar Es Salaam and Zanzibar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PV Contribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Coordination, design, training, mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What’s special?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Nothing like LILO Identity in Tanzania where LGBT people can talk about themselves and their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Attitudinal shifts at individual, family, community and organisational levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ 15 LILO Identity facilitators trained (75% of target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ 640 LGBT participated in LILO Identity workshop (53% of target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Security (Government crackdown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Lack of ownership (leading to misuse of funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Partner and facilitator drop out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid – Term Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Immediate outcomes clear, but impact level goals less clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ LGBT focus (not MSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ LGBT people as people not as development subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Revisioning workshop to redefine relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Need for skilled OD practitioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uganda Project

Objectives
- Reduce minority stress / self stigma
- Build organisational capacity
- Societal stigma
- Safety and security & research (cross cutting)

Overview
- Implemented by PV & LGBT Denmark
- 2016 - 2018
- 3 In-country partners
- Funded by CSU Denmark

2017
- LILO ToT
- Learning and Sharing Event – Learning from Innovation
- LILO Peer Counselling
- LILO Voice

Q & A Discussion

Questions and answers from the discussion immediately following the Tanzania presentation were clustered into broad themes as follows:

Note that responses often generate more questions than answers which then informed thematic conversations throughout the rest of the event.

LILO systems

- How can we measure the impact of LILO over time?
- How can we keep the group of LILO participants connected?
- What are the optimal conditions before and after LILO for maximising change?

We need to figure out a process of accompaniment of organisations through a process of LILOs (from LILO Identity to LILO Peer Counselling to LILO Voice).

We know that LILO results in immediate changes in attitudes at various levels (individual, family, community, organisational etc.), but we need to understand the long-term changes through longitudinal impact studies.

Something happens in the first 2-3 days following a LILO workshop. That momentum is then either lost or sustained – what are the steps to ensure momentum is sustained? What steps amplify the benefits of the workshop? We need to conduct an analysis of the conditions that lead to sustained movement.

What about within the organisation at a practical level? LILO has an incredible ripple effect in organisations.

Movement building

- What is the difference between movement building and community change?
- What is the distinction between community-led initiatives and service delivery based projects?

There is Movement with a big M and movement with a small m. Movement building (big M) relates to formal, political change processes, whereas movement building (small m) relates to community change at a more personal and social level. Small changes at community level lead to bigger change.
Everyone else is doing Movement building with a big M. There is a need to deconstruct the language in order to have more clarity. How do those M’s connect? Are we always clear on which level we are working at? Is it always clear to our partners? This has implications for programme design, our theory or change and our measurement markers.

How do we value and strengthen LGBT led organisations in order to help build a movement? Or are they just delivering services? LILO facilitators are the future leaders of the movement. But not all LGBT people want to start an organisation. We tend to Conflate CSOs with civil society. But sometimes the best work cannot be funded or measured. As LGBT rights in Africa is a hot topic at the moment, there is a building donor frenzy around the LGBT sector, and a risk that sector will collapse as with early PLHIV support groups. We need to find ways to responsibly support emerging activists and organisations to grow without causing them to collapse.

Key Insight: Too much money, too quickly can risk ‘overheating’ within emerging LGBT organisations.

Government relations

- How do you establish linkages and relationships with government and generate uptake of services within hostile environments?

In Tanzania, partners often feel as though they operate in secret. Facilitators have been arrested and detained. One of the things partners have asked for is an official letter or presentation about what the workshop is so that they can share that if activities are questioned. This needs to be carefully framed, for example ‘youth personal development’ workshop.

Monitoring systems

- How do we monitor efficiencies at a systems level (to minimise fraud)?

We have learnt from PV’s experience in Namibia. One way is to have external validation of workshops.

Communications

- What does the communication flow look like between LILO trainers, LILO facilitators and Executive Directors?

Communications tends to be directly with facilitators in order to support them. For higher level discussions Directors are cc’d. All but 1 director is also a facilitator.

Communications at various level of the organisation can cause some disruption if it messes with the internal dynamics and politics of that organisation. How do we communicate without causing internal disruption?

The relationship is generally with individuals rather than organisations. Informal communication platforms such as what’s app can also cause challenges. For example it is difficult to document.

Other questions not immediately addressed that fed into thematic conversations, include:

- Does organisational development work influence capacity of those organisations to roll out LILO and manage funding?
Safety and security – what is the most appropriate response? How do we address tensions around donor and partner expectations?

What are some good practices around holistic programming such as co-design, learning spaces, individualised OD?

What are the limits to partnership?

**KP Connect**

**Presentation summary**

Sylvie Pawele, Programme Advisor and Katie McDonald, M&E Advisor for KP Connect provided a brief overview of the programme to date, including findings from the 2016 Mid-Term Review, as follows:

**The journey so far**

2014: Start up workshops, baseline information, gathering intelligence on countries, etc.

2015: Setting priorities at country level, and relationships building: slow start up of implementation – mostly driven by KPC team.

2016: We saw the momentum building – more country driven interventions

**Main activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1: Organisational capacity development</th>
<th>Outcome 2: Advocacy</th>
<th>Outcome 3: Learning and Sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◦ Organisation Development activities</td>
<td>◦ Advocacy at LO level (internally) and at external stakeholders levels</td>
<td>◦ LSEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Core/framework documents development</td>
<td>◦ LSE</td>
<td>◦ Inter-programmes learning and exchange (LINKUP, SHARP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Media and communities sensitisation</td>
<td>◦ Engagement of opinion leaders</td>
<td>◦ LOs exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ KP networks development</td>
<td>◦ Facilitation of formation processes and support to KP networks</td>
<td>◦ Cross learning through KPC advisors’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ LSE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LILO Connect**

From a workshop to a tool that connects the dots...

| ◦ a tool to build capacity of LOs staff and partners | ◦ a tool for advocacy | ◦ a tool for linking, learning and networking |
Challenges and Limitations

- Partners fixed idea of project funding vs capacity development process
- Building momentum, getting buy-in/ownership, generating commitment in multi-country/stakeholder projects
- Communication
- Partners prioritising KP Connect against other programmes, commitments and interests
- Same budget allocation VS vastly different absorption capacity
- Time and resources needed to build relationships at country level

KP Connect Mid Term Review Highlights

- KP Connect implementation model highly relevant, efficient, effective, flexible and responsive
- Significant progress in all outcome areas, especially 1 and 3
- LILO Connect found to be a core mechanism underpinning progress

Annual Review 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational shifts</th>
<th>Environmental shifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved organisational health</td>
<td>Government recognition that KPs exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed organisational practice and culture</td>
<td>Government has a stronger focus on KPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed language and attitudes towards KPs / understanding KP issues</td>
<td>Improved access to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater cohesion and alignment around KP vision and strategy</td>
<td>Improved referral systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better positioning for attracting and retaining KP funding</td>
<td>Greater involvement of KPs in programme delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better reputation / profile among peer organisations</td>
<td>Reduced stigma in public health care facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in knowledge of KP issues</td>
<td>Inclusion of KPs in the Global Fund CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of reflective; evidence-based; rights-based approaches to programming</td>
<td>More public hospitals offering KP related services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased volume of KP work</td>
<td>Development of minimum service delivery standards for KPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger working relationships with KPs</td>
<td>Attitudinal change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of KP coalition / network / consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified influential KP champions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Way forward

- **Advocacy**: supporting KP networks’/coalitions’ agendas; implementing LILO Connect to support attitudinal change and as contribution to other advocacy objectives; encouraging regional-level LO advocacy (linked to Alliance Centre initiative)
- **OD and capacity development**: strengthening KP organisations and networks; embedding changes/improvements made by LOs during the course of KPC; resource mobilisation for continuing development beyond the life of KP Connect and for sustaining LILO Connect implementation; **AND**
- **Crosscutting 1 and 2**: emphasis on institutionalising a **learning culture and systems** by encouraging reflection on process and practice during the above work; continued documentation and sharing learning between and beyond LOs

Q & A Discussion

**Working with non-KP partners**

- What are the partnerships / relationship dynamics like when working at Linking Organisation (LO) level instead of KP level?

In KP Connect, the LO is the main entry point. We can’t go around the LOs as the Alliance. But we try to influence the relationships between LOs and KP CSOs. Many LOs had a lot of anxiety around engaging with KPs. In some cases, it has taken 2 years - partly because of competition for resources, but we try to encourage LOs and KPs to avoid those dynamics and work instead work in a coalition.

Each institution has a story. You have to establish trust first. In many places it is now possible to engage more widely (beyond the LO) because we have that trust.

Trust costs time and money but these are not factored into proposals. We need to build this into start up time so that the relationship can lead over the ‘agenda’. It also helps if you are able to back up interventions with resources. For example, if a need for strategic planning is identified, it helps if you are able to support that process. Resourcing is necessary to take the next step.

---

**Key insight: relationships are the oil that start the cogs moving**

---

**Strengthening the Alliance in Africa**

- Has the programme strengthened the Alliance in Africa or 9 LOs? Whose perspective does that represent – Secretariat, LOs, or KPs?

KP Connect has strengthened both individual LOs and the Alliance. The Alliance is the sum of its parts. By default, stronger LOs equals a stronger Alliance. At a regional level, there is more direct cooperation and communication between LOs. Until 3 years ago, the Alliance in Africa was run by a head office and communication had to be brokered between LOs by the Secretariat. Now they are communicating directly with each other.

The value of KP Connect is also wider than Alliance as it feeds into other programmes that LOs are implementing.
Applications of learning and sharing

- The LSEs generated a lot of transferable principles across the Alliance – what happens with those learnings?

The LSEs were a powerful mechanism for sharing, profile raising and networking. The latest Blue Sky Week echoed the LSE format because of the good feedback received from those events. The principles and process that informed the LSEs has been adopted by the Alliance.

Measuring capacity

- Tracking capacity strengthening outcomes?

Organisational capacity building is notoriously difficult to measure. In an ideal world you would have an organisational assessment tool that provides a baseline and endline in order to quantitatively track progress. However, although we did undertake a baseline, we largely rely on qualitative data. Partly because we prioritised relationship building at the start of the programme over extractive data collection. We try to identify examples of changes within organisational culture and practices and then make plausible linkages to the support provided.

KP work

- What does engaging in KP work mean? Mainstream sensitisation within the organisation or targeted KP projects?

‘KP work’ varies significantly between organisations depending on where they are coming from, where they want to go, and the environment in which they operate. For some it means mainstreaming across the organisation, for others it is the implementation of KP projects.

Network building

- What network strengthening processes have you used?

Network building has been informal and issues based. We support emerging and established networks. There are examples of LOs willing to accompany KP CSOs, but it depends on the baggage. It is difficult if there is a history of bad relationships. In some countries mentoring is not a valid role for LOs to take.

KP Connect has provided capacity support but also acted as a domino. The programme does not have a set number of activities in each country, so it offers flexibility. But it takes time to build trust to work in that way.

Government engagement

- How do you get stakeholders such as government and police to come to a LILO Connect workshop?

It is about the way you present it. We take more of a KP / public health approach rather than a human rights approach.
Learning from practice and content

After the two presentations and some initial discussion and surfacing of key questions and ideas around learning from practice, some key themes were identified for further exploration through conversation. This discussion shaped the remainder of the programme.

A number of potential and interrelated fields of conversation emerged, however, these were distilled into some core themes:

- Working with partners;
- The BIG project – PVs contribution;
- Safety and security;
- Organisational development; and
- LILo effectiveness.

Working with partners

This conversation was informed by some key questions, including:

- What is the nature of relationships?
- How do we ensure partners are effective and accountable?
- How do we design programmes for ideal relationships?
- How can we work together to achieve a shared goal?

Starting off right

The start of relationships affect how they go. This connects to the amount of time spent building the relationship at the start. There needs to be enough time to show each other who you are – for the relationship to be casual and mutual. This may mean negotiating push back of deliverables – otherwise is difficult to start well if the focus is on activities. We need to get out of the mindset that just focuses on the work plan without taking time to build the relationship first.

It is possible to enter into long term relationships without funding – just around a shared vision. How much does the vision have to match in order to align? Organisations can have little in common but in the areas that do match, they can work together well.

There is a need to align to good donors and partners to allow for flexibility and relationship building. PV has been able to move away from bad donors. Donors need to be open to a more protracted way of granting so there is time to develop relationship before deciding on work plan and budget allocations.

Often partners are pre-determined by the programme design, but that is not necessarily where the magic happens.

Principles for relationship building

Relationships should:

- be by invitation (it is possible to nurture an invitation)
- be a journey with partners about what’s important for them
- be based on common respect – that may mean participating in things that aren’t your priority
- serve more than an instrumental purpose
To do this we need to:

- have a reputation that we listen to needs
- not take a blanket approach
- practice people centred ways of working
- rebuild trust with partners at the outset of a new relationship, even if there is familiarity
- be clear on PV’s role and revisit and repeat that for clarity – in order to manage expectations and avoid misunderstanding
- be honest about levels of power within the development food chain
- create real opportunities for partners (and PV) to say no (what do we need to say no to in order to ensure the quality of our work?)
- challenge our assumptions about partnerships - equitable / adult relationships may not always be possible
- foster equity so partners and people in community own the outcomes
- pause and step away when it’s not working – take time to revise the relationship and offering
- be able to scale up / down easily with the funds – so that work and relationships are not driven by staff interests and jobs

---

**Key insight:** A real yes requires an opportunity for a real no.

---

**Working at different levels**

PV needs to be able to work at different levels in order to be holistic and contribute towards systemic change. In practice this has implications for how we work. There is a difference between working with established versus emerging organisations. When working with emerging organisations, organisational strengthening often needs to happen concurrently with delivery of the work.

Maybe we should not expect individual activists and community based organisations to behave like NGOs - maybe that is not their best strength. Community members are not necessarily interested in structuring as an NGO. In reality there is a diversity of community systems, yet within development there is a mimicking of organisational structures at community level. Can an activist stay as an activist or do they need to change / professionalise? How do you work with a group to support their function (without necessarily formalising as an organisation)? How do you disrupt the discourse that you should raise funds etc.? There may be other organisations in country that have the capacity to sub-grant or do micro-disbursements. We need to look for partners at different levels.

---

**Key insight:** Civil Society Organisations are not a substitute for community.

---

It is all about change – the level and scale is different. People buy you not the change. How you position yourself is important. The answers must come from them. We are there to facilitate, not as an expert.

Messy is not necessarily a failure. The most successful interventions are sometimes painful.
Day 2: Overnight reflections

Overnight reflections focused on the relationship between relationships, process and task and how PV incorporates these elements into its ways of working.

---

**Key insight:** The spaces in between count - as with music we need to ‘play the rests’ in order to give the notes meaning.

---

Discipline in necessary for ‘playing the rests’. It is a practice that is hard to maintain, requiring intentionality – not just running at full tilt.

We need to make sure that the space to think and moments to stop and question activities and interventions is built into our practice. It is part of how we work. We need to defend it. It enriches the quality of what we do. It is an asset.

In most organisations, most people focus on the task. There is always a strong drive and strong pressure to focus on task – activities and outputs. Many organisations are in survival mode and are therefore task driven. Deliverables is what gets funded. But the priority in the beginning has to be on relationships as this is the basis for movement.

PV is good at process and is able to demystify and practically apply process, by putting language to the obscure. The strong focus on process and relationships is what differentiates us from other organisations. But this has to lead to tasks – **process has to connect to outputs**. Although tasks can change as a result of process and relationships. This requires a **long-term orientation** and building rests into how we work with others. There is a small ‘light touch’ that connects these things.

Other people and organisations can be taught to think this way by being exposed to it. The question is, is there a formula to accelerate transference?
Learning from practice and content (continued)

After reconnecting and reflecting on the previous day, the group continued to explore themes in conversation. In plenary the group discussed PV’s big change project before breaking into three smaller groups to explore other themes in-depth.

The Big project – our contribution

This conversation was guided by the following questions:

- What is the 30-40 year change project?
- How should PV position itself?
- How do we imagine change unfolding?

Level of change

PV works at different levels. The underlying Theory of Change in the Tanzania project is a good way of expressing PV’s LGBT strand – whereby PV facilitates a process to empower people to do things in the community resulting in changes at the level of family, friends, society, policy etc.

This process would not necessarily be the same with other marginalised groups such as sex workers.

Disrupting development discourse

There is not one development discourse. We mainly sit in the USAID/Global Fund development discourse. There is also the Scandinavian. We align more with them. However, the countries we work in are influenced by the US paradigm. We can’t predict the Scandinavian discourse will stay enabling in an increasingly conservative global environment. We need to critically engage as PV in present and alternative expressions of development.

PV is not exclusively engaged in an LGBT discourse either. There are other experiences of exclusion. Expressions of marginalisation is strong in the LGBT world at the moment but sex workers, PLHIV and others also experience exclusion. We need to be careful of LGBT rights discourse over taking human rights discourse – it is counterproductive. We need a more generic discussion about equity etc.

Long-term approaches

We try to talk beyond immediate need – to focus on social transformation – health, equity, race, gender. We want societies where people can live their lives. People are more concerned with their complete lives not just their HIV status. The goal is equitable societies where people are free to live.

Development subjects

Too often the focus is on people seen to be the problem. The problem is exclusion, inequity, marginalisation etc. That is a cultural problem. The carriers of the problem are individuals. Therefore it is not about structural interventions. Change is at the level of both the individuals who experience and those who perpetuate the problem. We need to ask questions of those who perpetuate the problem and act as a provocateur.
Key insight: We need to highlight people are not the problem. The outside world is the problem.

The individual is the entry point but the level of work is personal and interpersonal. Saying we focus on the individual shuts out the possibility of working with community.

We work with individuals as agents of change but they are not necessarily the end product or target. We try to inspire them and give tools to influence their systems.

Culture is in the space between people. We need to know the space to criticise from within. We do cultural change work within multi-cultural systems. That raises questions about who should do this work.

PV as catalyst
PV runs the risk of dropping ‘LILO bombs’ and focusing too much on task and target rather than relationships and process.

Personalisation is a powerful process. It is different from seeing the individual as target / object. If people go deep enough they will take steps.

Personalisation always a first step. We try to equip people to take a next step. LILO Identity creates a space around LGBT people. The heterosexual world crowds out people. In a LILO workshop they have space to be themselves. It helps them think through some stuff. LILO Voice equips them to push back and start to connect with each other in order to enlarge that space. What does the accompaniment that needs to happen then look like? To ensure there is enough efficacy to take a step. Is it enough they take a step for themselves? How does it cascade into systemic change?

PV acts as a catalyst. What does that mean beyond LILO? We need to ask critical questions and disrupt systems.

Safety and security
Safety and security was first discussed in-depth in a small group and then together in plenary. The following summarises content from both discussions.

Deconstructing the solidarity definition
Solidarity doesn’t mean that you over identify with owning what’s happening locally. It is about standing together whilst remaining external. What we don’t want to do is become totally risk averse. We need to figure out a way of assessing the probability that something will happen and what to do if it does. In a sensitive context, before every interaction, we need to put time aside to think through a risk management plan. That should be systematised in the planning process. We need to think through ways in which to decrease risk (realistically) so that there is an acceptable level of risk (at both internal and relational levels).

We have to work responsibly and ethically so people are not unfairly exposed - though if people are exposed, we will stand together in that place - what does that mean? We also have to realise that our own engagement can actually increase risk. For example for LILO facilitators. Being a LILO facilitator shifts their social status and visibility and can have safety and security implications.
There is a way that externals can be appropriately supportive and this is something we would need to define before the relationships move forward.

Partners may have a different risk comfort level. Often they have experienced human rights violations, police harassment, and arrest. As such, their risk tolerance can be much higher. How can we reconcile different perceptions of risk between partners?

**Conditioning the environment - mitigating the risk**

There is a particular context in which projects operate - the environment is often hard - how do we soften that and cultivate allies, even in light ways, to help make the path forward softer? There should always be a deep assessment of the environment in which the project will operate. If it’s not an enabling environment, then there should be more of this conditioning work. We need to engage in a deep context analysis so we can figure out how much of this conditioning work is needed (at cultural, social and political levels). We can build allies and awareness of the work with allies that are not just about LGBT and in more universal language.

**Mainstreaming safety and security planning**

We need to engage in discussions around what our tolerance levels are. We are cognisant that the best mitigation strategy is being pre-emptive - not ‘what we do when a situation occurs?’ When a situation arises we need to assess the level of volatility and if it is the best time for the kind of work we do. In some cases it may be better to lay low and check in again soon. These conversations and scenario planning should happen with partners at the beginning of a project but also mainstreamed so that it is reinforced at every group interaction - for example incorporate safety and security training and scenario planning into LILO training.

Partners on the ground will always have a better understanding of actual risk levels – but how far are we prepared to go to help? Will we pay for flights or bribes – or speak out in front of the media? People panic when things go wrong and that is not the time to have these discussions.

There is a need for policies and systems that take safety and security into account. Not just for our partners, but for PV staff and consultants travelling to volatile or hostile contexts. It should not be up to the individual to decide if they are comfortable travelling. The organisation must take responsibility if they are sending staff to difficult environments.

**Resourcing**

Resourcing for safety and security should be mainstreamed into every interaction. There are other organisations who would be better at this than we are. Perhaps what we should do is provide the link to others - we could always put budget aside for emergencies though. We need a risk management plan - which should ideally be succinct and concise and useful so that people will use it. This will enable speedy resource mobilisation in an emergency. It is not helpful if it takes six months to mobilise the resources.

Safety and security should be built in to proposals.
Organisational development

PV’s approach to organisational development was first discussed in-depth in a small group and then together in plenary. The following summarises content from both discussions.

What do we mean when we say OD?

There is a need to bring OD into line with the methodology. PVs practice in relation to organisations is not coherent. We work with national intermediaries, CBOs and loose community groups. Different levels do not have all the same approach or requirements. Over the past few years there has been a huge amount of work put into refining the LILO methodology. There has not been as much investment into our approach to OD, which is almost an add-on to sustain LILO work, but that is not necessarily the case.

Different practitioners have different understandings of what OD means and how it might be similar or different to organisational strengthening. However, in general it was agreed that we do not do OD. Organisations develop in terms of complexity and capacity. That happens anyway - without intervention. We support that natural development process.

Having said that, there was still the view that PV needs a common understanding (stripped of the jargon) of what OD / OS means. Most people assume you run financial management workshops. ‘OD’ terminology can skew people’s expectations about what we offer.

For example, it may include:

- support through capacity strengthening
- coaching
- mentoring
- technical assistance
- whatever an organisation decides is its next envelopment step

Any OD activities should be by invitation and agreement. It could be one off or long term. It also depends on the programme boundaries.

PV not just doing generic OD. The offering is unique – the OD support that PV offers is not necessarily as others offer it. It is more intimate and personal. PV realises that people within organisations have baggage – and that baggage affects the work.

We need to name what it is that we offer, including aspects such as coaching and accompaniment.

Coaching - Personalisation is very valuable within an organisational context. We could look at doing the coaching in a different way. For example, doing more group coaching within a leadership team. This would deal with problems from working solely with emerging leaders (middle management), who are now becoming more competent that the leader which can be problematic. The leader needs to know what people are learning. This could be complemented by one or two individual supports either from a PV coach or local support.

Accompaniment - When accompaniment has worked well, what is it that leads to individuals and organisations feeling supported? Usually it comes down to the person. Some people are natural connectors. They just check in, give some ideas, and attend partner’s events etc. – just because they are genuinely interested. It is almost more like a case worker or empathetic talking partner. That sort of work is hard to justify as a consultant billing by the hour.
“You can make more friends in two months by becoming interested in other people than you can in two years by trying to get other people interested in you” - Dale Carnegie (shared by Patsy)

Human resourcing

We need to articulate our approach to OD more so that we can get more people to do this work. We have a capacity problem. Strategic people are too operational and day to day. We need to buy in capacity. We need to communicate to these new people what the ask is. It is hard for new people who join us to understand what the work is. We need some sort of orientation for new people.

How do you employ those who want to build those relationships; people who are connectors? There was some discussion around the nature of such a role. On the one hand it was identified as beneficial in having a separation between supporting and monitoring roles – in which case the connector would not necessarily do the work, just hold the relationship. Yet on the other hand, it was identified that the connecting person has always been someone who can also do the work. If partners need to relate to several persons instead of one, the connector could slide into a bureaucrat role. This person also needs to be able to make decisions. There was some consensus that the connector should be the core person delivering the method (LILO) but not also an OD person who has to hold them accountable. We need to further define competencies for such a role.

LILO for organisations?

The principle of supporting organisations to do work is good if it goes hand in hand with LILO and other things. But is it time to develop a single intervention that is a LILO for organisations which fits with our principles? After that, everything else is tailor made based on the fit for purpose tool.

We could use a hybrid of core skills or LILO for leaders. There is something about being peers together as a form of development. And another thing about working within teams.

This potential new LILO workshop was envisioned as an opportunity to meet each other, to share stories and history with an organisation, to identify points of connection. An opportunity to take a step back, which inevitably becomes an energising conversation. It always creates movement and buy-in – to sit as colleagues and people who are responsible for the current situation – to think from the heart, not just the head.

This could be offered as step 1 to everyone across all projects. Let’s start together - Where are we? What are we about? Where are we going? What we can offer beyond that depends on the project Ownership and process must then be negotiated.

This meeting would create an opportunity for a real yes or no. After meeting each other, maybe we don’t want to work together if it is highly dysfunctional. Maybe they do not want to work with us. We assume we have something to offer and something people want. We can prime it from the outset as a plausible option – we are not sure this is a fit for us. What would be some of the check boxes? (Psychotic leaders). Will we or won’t we work together? An exploration whereby we reach an agreement through the process.

This is an opportunity to agree how we want to work together. Then if someone breaks the agreement it is easier to exit. It gives space to articulate what is the bottom line.
Potential design elements include:

- starting with relationships and values (like other LILO workshops)
- reflection and reconnecting with identity and vision
- organisational bio/background
- working together (a carefully designed; conscious conversation)
- connection before contracting
- beginning the process of accompaniment

After this initial workshop comes the offer, for example the option for fit for purpose to identify needs or, if needs are already known, negotiating resourcing to address those needs. People will be more open after this initial contact. There is a need to have honest conversations about the relationships within the organisation before having the technical conversation. Therefore it should happen prior to the contracting process. This is also an opportunity to boundary our OD support.

This would require significant investment before any work together. We would need to take this into account. Who would resource this – us or the client? Can the programme accommodate it or would we connect to someone else to support?

Practically we would need two people from PV there as it is about the relationship.

How do we measure organisational development?

A number of questions about measuring organisational development emerged through the conversation:

- How do we recognise if organisations are getting better, healthier, stronger? What tells you that (indicators)?
- We can have objective tools for comparisons across programmes (such as fit for purpose) but what does success look like for you (the partner) and how do we measure that? The tone is that we don’t measure you – you measure us.

Maximising the LILO effect

Ways to maximise the LILO effect was first discussed in-depth in a small group and then together in plenary. The following summarises content from both discussions.

The conversation was guided by the question:

- What do we need to achieve self-efficacy and maximise the value of LILO?

Connect the dots

Throughout the workshop, the risk of dropping ‘LILO bombs’ without a process for follow up was raised. This was considered useful for LILO Connect but essential for LILO Identity.

In some programmes, such as those in East Africa, LILO is offered as a series of workshops from Identity to Voice to Peer Counselling. Each of these workshops builds on and deepens the conscientisation process initiated in the first workshop. For example, the LILO Peer Counselling curriculum has many possibilities. It can deepen skills for facilitators. It is not always just training for them to use as counsellors but helps deepen understanding.

However, the need for follow up in between workshops to maintain and maximise the LILO effect was identified as a gap.
Supporting facilitators to accompany participants

The need for ongoing support and accompaniment was identified as important for participants and facilitators. Just as trainers accompany facilitators, trainers need to support facilitators to follow up and accompany participants. We may need to add to a section to the training of facilitators’ manual on doing support / follow up work. Or plan for monthly supportive supervisions. This has budget implications and may mean fewer trainings, or limit the range of partners we work with and / or the geographic base.

LILO groups

LILO identity workshops encourage groups to self-organise. However, it is difficult for facilitators to follow up if there is geographic spread. People don’t necessarily self-organise because of the stigma. However the capacity for LGBT to self-organise is different from PLHIV. LGBT people do tend to create informal groups naturally. However, groups do not always promote healthy behaviour.

Maintaining quality control and measuring success

Some concerns were raised about maintaining quality control in other countries where organisations are using LILO with funding from other organisations. For example in Ivory Coast. What might a minimum service package look like?

This raised additional questions about measuring success - how do we know accompaniment is working? How do we know outcomes are achieved? How do we document examples of catalysts – for example changed responses and behaviours, like someone standing up for themselves at a health care facility.

Most significant change was suggested as a process for monitoring and documenting as well as touching base in between LILO bombs.

KP Connect and beyond

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

Katie McDonald presented briefly on the key planned MEL outputs for 2017, including both required reporting and knowledge products, as depicted in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required reporting</th>
<th>Knowledge products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ 2016 Annual Report</td>
<td>➢ LILO Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ 2014 – 2017 Programme Report</td>
<td>➢ Outcome 1: OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Evaluation ‘Study’</td>
<td>➢ Outcome 2: Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Social Network re-Mapping</td>
<td>➢ Outcome 3: Learning and sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The session largely focused on generating ideas for the Programme Evaluation ‘Study’. Due to the late Mid-Term Review, it was agreed with SIDA that instead of a traditional evaluation we could rather do a more **focussed and in depth study** looking at selected specific themes for example regionalisation and Southern leadership, the long term accompaniment approach to capacity building across the different contexts and the use of LILO as an effective underpinning methodology. Approaching it in this way allows opportunities for digging deeper into key topics.

Questions devised to guide group discussion included:

1) What do we want to be able to say at the end of KPC?
2) What themes should we explore?
3) What hypotheses should we test (linked to our Theory of Change)?
4) What questions should we ask ourselves?
5) What bigger/cross-programme learning/research agenda do we want to connect to?

A number of ideas emerged based on this discussion, including:

**KP Connect Implementation model**

What we submitted to SIDA was changed after it was approved by SIDA. Why did we change? The **accompaniment approach** was incorporated, as part of PV methodology and way of working. How did we justify **programme design choices**? Such as:

- The conscious decision to involve the LO leaders at beginning of the project
- The value add of long-term accompaniment
- The use of LILO Connect as a linking element – connecting the outcomes

**Hypothesis:** In order for LOs to do effective work with KPs there was a need for understanding the ‘other’.

**Hypothesis:** By investing time in long-term relationships, and having a project design with built-in flexibility, we produce better informed work, better relationships and positioning and more sustainable change.

For SIDA, it is important to draw out the lessons learned from this implementation model.

When KP Connect started there was a drive within the Alliance towards programme implementation led by a **partnership**. KP Connect makes a strong case for how and why it worked well. It is more than a structural/operational decision. Reaffirmation of the **southern leadership model** is crucial for the Alliance, looking at very particular contributions made towards better programming.
Emerging questions: Why did the programme management approach work well? What are the learnings from this approach? What are the core principles for working in this way? Does southern leadership leverage additional funding? Does it impact on the way the Alliance works?

Impact
It is important to also capture the impact at KP level (both in terms of relationships and programme content), as well as impact of learning and sharing at regional level (of interest for SIDA) – for example more peer-to-peer connections and the PV – ANCS – KANCO triangle, which has come out of KP Connect.

Beneficiaries
There was a suggestion to explore who has benefited from KP Connect, and in what ways. For example:

➔ What has Positive Vibes gotten out of KP Connect, as manager for an Alliance programme?

Sustainability
Suggestions were also made in relation to the question of sustainability – and the change in trajectory for LOs as a result.

➔ What type of work will LOs be doing in 10 years’ time as a result of KP Connect?

Satisfaction
Satisfaction was also identified as an area to explore:

➔ How has the KP Connect experience been for LOs?

Principles for stimulating enabling environments
It is important to consider the audience for the KP Connect Evaluation Study and how it might be used. Will Alliance and LOs necessarily adapt to findings of KP Connect Evaluation/Study? How can this study support the Alliance to be better positioned to better inform policy type stuff and argue that “this work matters”? For example:

➔ What does it take to influence for a more enabling environment for KP Programming?

It was noted that some of these ideas may be explored through other outputs (such as social network mapping), not necessarily through the evaluation study.

It was also suggested that instead of a single study, we might rather do undertake a series of articles focusing on different core aspects, but we may still need to prioritise which areas to focus on depending on resourcing.
There was also some general discussion around attribution and critical success factors for MEL:

- It is impossible to have 100% attribution. We can only illustrate the changes and the activities and connect the dots. At the end of the project we have a better idea of what the dots are, because of similar changes seen across the LOs KP Connect has worked with.
- Keep M&E simple and creative.
- Importance of ‘luxury of time’ to constantly (re)read data and connect the dots.

Next steps

Is KP Connect a model we want to take forward and how? In this session we explored the logical next steps for KP Connect (as if it was going to continue), other ideas for programmes stemming from this work and ways of doing it (for example, PV partnership with the Alliance; Alliance subcontracting to PV; PV partnership with another LO; the Alliance Centre with an LO).

There were three main ideas for logical next steps for KP Connect, as follows:

Advocacy work

We need to continue with outcome 2 (advocacy). There is synergy with influencing work under the Amplify Change (Alliance Centre) and Pitch (Alliance Secretariat) projects. Where are the potential links between KP Connect and the Alliance Centre? There may be a business development opportunity.

Amplify Change seeks to learn from local experience and connect it to regional level advocacy; whilst Pitch operates at a regional level. KP Connect, on the other hand, operated at the national level, suggesting there may be a gap going forward to support national intermediaries to engage in national and regional level advocacy. The flexibility to work with and support organisations (wherever they are at) that was inherent in KP Connect could complement Pitch (especially in overlapping countries such as Kenya and Uganda). Organisations such as CHAU (Uganda) will need to figure out how to work with their new Pitch partners. Perhaps this is where KP Connect can add value – by encouraging an approach to working with others, and building the capacity to do advocacy.

We need to better articulate what it means at national level to engage with KP CSOs and the role of national intermediaries in relation to KP CSOs. This might include who we should work with and bring into the process. Perhaps it is better to have fewer, deeper relationships.

Continuation of current organisational strengthening work and institutional change

Maybe it is not about taking another step, but figuring out how we stay on this step longer. KP Connect could make a case to continue accompaniment. It is about solidarity and longitudinal support. Few organisations are able to finance internal technical consultants. The resources within KP Connect / Positive Vibes can be further leveraged by the Alliance.

Although the Secretariat has been through a change process, LOs haven’t. It would make sense to connect continued accompaniment work to the Alliance change process. Institutions need to anticipate the future and adapt faster – that is the key to survival. That does not happen unaccompanied in most cases.

KP Connect 2.0 would provide an opportunity to start again in a different way. Although PV worked hard to overcome cynicism, there is need to bring the rest along to keep trust. How do you extend the conversation before it matures? When and with whom do you have this conversation? How to
get a conversation going at the Secretariat? It is difficult to get people to see beyond a project. PV needs to make an offer and influence people at the directors meeting and in the Secretariat. Would systems change work sit with PV or the Centre? There is huge potential in being the driver of a cultural change project.

**Knowledge transfer and application**

Whilst not a new project post KP Connect, it is important to consider knowledge transfer and application to ensure the learnings from KP Connect are not lost but are embedded in future programming and practice – both within PV and LOs. How does that happen? What is the link to changing programmes? What principles for knowledge transfer and application need to be integrated into ways of working?

The Alliance Centre is planning to test content from the sex worker LSE synthesis report with sex worker organisations in South Africa. This will be a vehicle to carry and apply content.

**Recap and reflection**

By sharing experiences from two PV programmes, the group was able to identify several key themes to inform a series a conversations about practice and design, before moving into more operational discussions about M&E and future programming within KP Connect. As a result some clear trajectories of work emerged, including:

- Development and mainstreaming of safety and security policies and procedures
- Further articulate and clarify PVs approach to OD and accompaniment in alignment with LILO methodology
- Development of a ‘LILO for Organisations’ to serve as an entry point for working with new partners
- Articulating core competencies for ‘connectors’ and OD practitioners as PV expands its human resources
- Identify methodologies for measuring OD and LILO over time
- Make additions to the LILO Identity training of facilitators manual around ongoing support and accompaniment between facilitators and participants
- Exploration of a ‘light touch’ process to connect the LILO workshops (potentially integrated with a monitoring process such as most significant change)
- Develop a concept note and flesh out more specifically ideas for the KP Connect ‘evaluation study’
- Develop a proposal for KP Connect next steps to take to the Secretariat (and other potential donors) around institutional change and/or advocacy