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WHY THE LAW MATTERS

Annual number of new HIV infections among adults aged 15–49
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Current legal and policy environment

With interventions for enhanced legal and policy environment

Social enablers matter

### Top-line targets for 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV services</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Societal enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-95-95 testing and treatment targets achieved within all subpopulations and age groups.</td>
<td>95% of people at risk of HIV infection use appropriate, prioritized, person-centred and effective combination prevention options.</td>
<td>Adoption of people-centred and context-specific integrated approaches that support the achievement of the 2025 HIV targets and result in at least 90% of people living with HIV and individuals at heightened risk of HIV infection linked to services for other communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases, sexual and gender-based violence, mental health and other services they need for their overall health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Less than 10% of countries have punitive legal and policy environments that deny or limit access to services.
- Less than 10% of people living with HIV and key populations experience stigma and discrimination.
- Less than 10% of women, girls, people living with HIV and key populations experience gender inequality and violence.

- Achieve SDG targets critical to the HIV response (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 16 and 17) by 2030.
AIMS

• Document and assess the **current funding environment** for community led responses to HIV in ESA
• Focus on how it effects **CSO’s ability to implement programming to address social enablers** including advocacy, community and political mobilisation and community monitoring, as well as for human rights programmes such as law and policy reform, and stigma and discrimination reduction.

OBJECTIVES

• Map out and assess **the impact of a changing donor climate** on civil society, specifically those implementing social enabler and human rights programming in the context of HIV, in ESA
• Identify **barriers to access to funding** by CSOs implementing social enabler and human rights programming;
• Assess the **impact of the COVID-19** pandemic on funding for community-led responses to HIV
• Make **recommendations** for addressing barriers to access to funding for CSOs and for ensuring that at least 30% of all service delivery is community-led by 2030; and that at least 6% of HIV resources are allocated for social enabling activities.
Methodology

• Desk review;
• Online survey with ARASA partners;
• Key informant interviews with CSOs/CBOs and donors; and
• 2 Phases: Report updated with rapid assessment of impact of COVID-19 – desk review
Findings

How has funding for your organisation changed over the past 3-5 years?

“There was a point where there was an increase, but in the last 2 years, things are now extremely challenging”.

“The landscape has changed dramatically. It’s not shifting for the better. There is shrinking funding. When you look at the big donor organisations, they themselves are going through their own (changes in) strategies, engaging in transitions, phasing out of countries.”
Findings

Barriers to funding for community responses, social enablers and human rights

• Shrinking civil society space
• Rapid changes in donor priorities; mismatch with strategic plans
• Decrease in core funding, shift to funding of programme activities

“What’s changed is that there’s been a move away from core funding to programmatic funding. It’s not impossible, but it makes it more difficult, building the core costs into programmes but not calling it that. Donors are happy to throw programme funds, but who do they think is doing the work?”

• Short-term funding

“Our greatest challenge is that when we have a donor, its projects of one year. You are doing good work, but it comes to end. You’re are just getting started, then have to start winding down. People build expectations. They still come to your offices, but you can’t offer them services. You have vibrant staff. But when the project ends, there is a brain drain, you lose them.”
Barriers continued...

• Capacity issues: Donors see funding of community-based organisations as too risky

“International NGOs are registering in Southern Africa, pretending to be African NGOs, and then they use their global resources to bid on global contracts and thereby squeeze out African organisations.”

• Human rights interventions need to be programmed differently

“What’s required for addressing human rights for key and vulnerable populations? Its complex, responsive; funding needs to be flexible and nimble. You need to have freedom to adjust to how the context is moving. ... Targets... need to be developed in careful consultation with organisations that have worked in the human rights space before and know what will make an impact”
Experiences with major donors

Global Fund

“The way in which they [Global Fund] structure the grants is really difficult for organisations to do meaningful work. Organisations are so busy with templates and targets that they lose sight of the meaning of the work around social change.”

US Government funding (including PEPFAR):

‘difficult to navigate’, ‘intimidating’, ‘very technical’, ‘very biomedical’, ‘rigid’, ‘a lot of bureaucracy’

“There is a significant misalignment between PEPFAR and what we stand for. They don’t take a person-centred approach. It’s about minimum investment, maximum scale.”
Findings

ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF MOBILISING RESOURCES

• CBOS/CSOs received all or most of their funding from foreign donors
• Very few from domestic governments
• Mindful of the need to prepare for transition, but what are the alternatives?
  o Social contracting
  o Alternative financing:
    ➢ Indirect state support: lotteries, tax deductions, subsidies, preferential rentals
    ➢ Leveraging internal resources: Social entrepreneurship; Consulting; Sale of goods; Membership fees; Sub-letting office space
    ➢ Private sector: Corporate social investment; co-branding;
    ➢ Interactions with society: crowdfunding; bequests; direct donations, debit orders

“Corporates like funding teddy bears for sick kids. Because we work with sex workers, drug users, and MSM – these are not popular causes”

“Organisations being forced to think in a language they don’t understand. The new Silicon Valley funders use a different model to groups who have traditionally done this work. ‘Return of investment’ on social justice work? How do you measure such things? I don’t know if civil society should ignore it or play the game.”
Impact of COVID-19

- CBOS/CSOs have been critical in responding swiftly, responsively, creatively, harnessing platforms and networks developed in HIV response;

- Rapid response grants – e.g Frontline AIDS, Aidsfonds, EJAF;

- Larger donors much slower to respond;

- Some CBOs experience or anticipate loss of donor funding, decrease in new grants for HIV;

- ARASA Study: Some smaller CBOs facing eviction, inability to retain staff;

- None of 25 CSOs had received funds from governments or NACs; and

- Fear for the future – economic crisis, donor governments more inward-looking
Recommendations for donors:

- **Social enablers and human rights require flexible funding**
  - Work on social enablers and human rights is fundamentally different to service delivery work.
  - Many donors’ reporting templates, budgets and monitoring frameworks tailored to service delivery programmes, not fit for purpose.

- **Social enablers and human rights require a longer-term investment**
  - Efforts to shift social norms, policies, structures and practices do not bear fruit in the short term.
  - Donors should either invest in long-term relationships with particular organisations, or should consider a five year grant periods.

- **Donors should coordinate better with each other**
  - Donors should coordinate to align around common goals, adopt common indicators, makes the evaluation of achievement of global targets a more achievable task.
  - Donors specifically should reach consensus on how to measure “community-led responses” and “social enablers”.

Recommendations for donors continued...

- **Support consortia**
  - Ambitious, comprehensive, layered interventions are likely to have the greatest impact on social enablers and human rights.

- **See beyond the proposal**
  - A strong proposal may not capture the specific set of skills and expertise which make an organisation effective at implementing community-based programmes.
  - Donors should think carefully about their selection criteria – which skills are most important, and how can they be assessed?

- **Minimise bureaucracy**
  - Either reduce the amount of administration, or adapt administrative requirements for organisations with lower levels of technical skills.
  - Donors and beneficiaries should think creatively and flexibly about how to simultaneously maximise accountability while minimising administration.