

Amplify Change Regional Networking Project  
Internal Review and Learning: Knowledge Products  
January 2019

Prepared for Positive Vibes Trust  
by Allan Moolman, dala! Consulting Services  
[www.dalaconsultingservices.com](http://www.dalaconsultingservices.com)

## Background

During the course of the review of the Amplify Change Regional Networking Project ('AC project'), **dala!** was asked by the Positive Vibes Trust (PV) team to undertake an additional assessment of the value and utilisation of the knowledge products generated in the course of the project. The PV team had a sense that the knowledge products were well received, but were uncertain as to the impact of these products on the practice and thinking of partner organisations engaged in the delivery of the AC project.

## Methodology

Given the time pressures, the consultants were only able to interview a small number of LOs and other project partners using a specific interview schedule based on the questions below:

1. Have coalition member organisations benefited from the SRHR learning and knowledge to shift their own positioning and programming when working with gender and sexual minority populations and sex workers?
2. Has the project enabled them to position themselves to undertake advocacy and influencing work either nationally or regionally?
3. What opportunities have presented themselves by broadening the scope of work to include comprehensive SRHR programming in their practice compared with a focused HIV service delivery model?
4. Are there any examples of a shift in including a rights-based approach to sexual and reproductive health services for key populations (gender and sexual minority populations and sex workers).

The interview information was supplemented by other data drawn from more extensive in-depth interviews conducted to assess the impact of the project (details in the accompanying *Internal Review and Learning Report*), as well as from an online questionnaire administered in the course of the review.

As with the other report, the conclusions drawn are from a relatively small interview sample, with a bias towards organisations directly involved in the management of the AC project.

## Findings

It must be stated upfront, that the AC project has only been active for a short time and that an assessment of the **impact** of the knowledge products and processes would be difficult to make. As a consequence, the decision was taken to instead

assess the **utility** of the products and processes at a point in time. The strategic impact of these will only become evident in the future as the participating organisations interrogate and internalise the content and begin to use this learning to develop new/different programmes.

To that end, some responses to the framing questions for this additional element to the full review are listed below.

**1. Have coalition member organisations benefited from the SRHR learning and knowledge to shift their own positioning and programming when working with gender and sexual minority populations and sex workers?**

It is clear from the discussions with LOs that they benefited from the learning and knowledge generated by the AC project:

*“Activities indeed managed to ‘spark’ a conversation about the need to ‘change’.”*

*“The multitude of knowledge that has been generated as well as the spaces that have been provided to collectively develop, synthesise, deliberate on and internalise this knowledge and practise that is catalysing a deeper comprehension, amongst this formation, around KP SRHR.”*

However, too short a time has passed to be able to assess adequately whether this has translated into a lasting shift to their positioning and programming in this space. Certainly the will is there in those spoken to, but this kind of change takes time.

*“I think there were opportunities provided in the various events during the project for learning and sharing on ‘SRHR’ and potentially translating this into shifts in personal/organisational positioning and programming. However, if this ‘shift’ indeed happened in part or fully, only time will tell...”*

**2. Has the project enabled them to position themselves to undertake advocacy and influencing work either nationally or regionally?**

The AC project certainly provided the tools for LOs to undertake advocacy and influencing work at different levels, and some content was generated by the AC project to support this:

*“Yes, the content generated has helped my organisation structure its SRHR offer. Helped us better craft what we mean when we say SRHR and helped us identify what areas in this vast field we are able to contribute to.”*

*“Critical thinking and analysis of the knowledge products... strengthens advocacy on a local level and enables engagement towards a national traction.”*

*“All this information is especially useful when considering our response to the SRHR needs of KPs. There is very little information available on this topic.”*

*“Learning from each other because sometimes when we are doing our advocacy work it is also important to hear what others are doing but also to self-evaluate ourselves as organisations.”*

*“That process was a plus, it was unique on its own in that is the first time that a group of regional organisations that are co-ordinating KPs to come together and share those experiences around how they have envisioned SRHR and rights in their broader sense to see what sort of work are we doing and how we can collaborate and strengthen each other.”*

Too little time has passed with the roll out of these tools and content to be able to assess whether LOs have re-positioned themselves, or whether this repositioning has enabled an increase in advocacy and influencing work:

*“Opportunities were provided through various project activities to better position organisations to undertake such advocacy and influencing work. I am [however] not aware of any such activity happening [right now].”*

### **3. What opportunities have presented themselves by broadening the scope of work to include comprehensive SRHR programming in their practice compared with a focused HIV service delivery model?**

A range of opportunities were presented through the AC project and its content focus on SRHR, with some reflections on the import of this given by respondents in response to an online survey question about project ‘highlights’:

*“Bringing together LOs and partners to jointly define a better strategy on the sexual and reproductive health of key populations.”*

*“The content generated on SRHR for KPs. The knowledge that was previously not available on the needs of SRHR for KP financing.”*

*“...participating organisations were equally appreciative of the opportunity to revisit their own organisational approaches moving from a ‘broader lens’ to one of being more inclusive of SRHR and the opportunity to ‘recognise’ the organisational focus on SRHR (from a much needed response point of view) has been for many years an integral part of their HIV response, without necessarily think of the organisational approach. While both of these ‘moments’ present an opportunity, I would not know how this has since been translated into tangible actions/measures within the respective organisations.”*

*“The knowledge products that the project has developed are insightful, well-researched and useful for programme managers and state officials.”*

Again, insufficient time has passed to assess whether this has translated into broader opportunities for these organisations, though certainly the knowledge products and processes that address SRHR programming and practice were well received and generated positive feedback.

**4. Are there any examples of a shift in including a rights-based approach to sexual and reproductive health services for key populations (gender and sexual minority populations and sex workers)?**

At this point in time, the only examples given were quite broad:

- integrating people-centred approaches:

*“I think it helped to change our ways of working looking beyond HIV and integrate SRHR and rights within our work because this is where the world is moving to and I think it’s also informed by some of the gaps that within communities we have been realising that while more people are testing but there is no further support for any other services that the community require and that helps to look at developing a peoples-centred approach to the work and that is something that AC really tried to push to try and look at people-centred approach in the work that we are doing and recognise that individual needs supersedes sometimes group needs especially when it comes to SRH services and needs.”*

- the need to include considerations of SRH and SDGs in the work:
 

*“To a point, based on the feedback from participants it was a positive project which elevated the people to realise that within the HIV sectors there has been changes to broaden our understanding to be inclusive of the SRH but also linking that to broader human rights but also understanding that the world has changed, people are now being inclusive of the SDG’s within their work.”*
- the need for a more strategic ‘birds’ eye’ analysis:
 

*“We don’t really see when we are implementing projects to be able to have that analytic view to social, political and economic changes but also understanding the global changes and recognising where we are headed to in terms of the targets that have been set globally and trying to see where we are a sector, as a coalition but also as within the work that we are hoping to achieve.”*

## Lessons for future programming

Feedback from respondents in relation to future programmes, building on the work of the AC project included:

- the need for service access advocacy:
 

*“The country has made great strides around SRH but there is still a need to do more, especially around advocacy. Accessing services for KPs are still denied key services due to stigma and discrimination.”*
- integrating SRHR for key populations into the broader SRHR space:
 

*“Strengthening practice around SRH within rights for sexual and gender minority populations and sex workers. Support for Transgender persons - but working in partnership with pre-identified organisations who have a basic understanding and approach to SRHR comprehensive programming - or at least a desire to shift.”*
- bringing in the regional dimension of advocacy action:
 

*“Strengthening the integration of regional advocacy.”*
- the need to develop ‘bottom up’ (i.e. informed by practice) evidence to support SRHR programmes:

*“Less of a focus on building a coalition and more focus on generating and integrating useful content into SRHR programs. How partners can be part of generating the knowledge so that it speaks to specific needs, therefore ensuring better content integration. Partners who participate should be better selected and connected to the content area.”*

Further lessons and related recommendations can be found in the main review and learning report.