

Supporting and Mitigating the Impact of HIV/AIDS for Livelihood Enhancement: Malawi

CONTEXT: Malawi remains extremely affected by HIV/AIDS, with nearly 12 percent of the population estimated as living with the disease in 2007 (World Health Statistics 2009). A lack of awareness surrounding contraception means that transmissions rose significantly between 1996 and 2000, from 23 to 55 percent among women and 47 to 71 among men (Malawi National Statistics Office 2000). This issue is further compounded by the fact that basic services such as health care are inaccessible to the poorest and most vulnerable Malawian citizens. Through strengthening citizen-state-private sector relations, improving the knowledge base surrounding HIV/AIDS and implementing citizen monitoring tools, the Supporting and Mitigating the Impact of HIV/AIDS for Livelihood Enhancement (SMIHLE) project aimed to develop and promote operational models that strengthen mainstreamed service delivery relating to HIV/AIDS and gender issues.

OBJECTIVE: To develop and promote operational models and practices that strengthen the delivery of food security services that mainstream HIV/AIDS and gender-related issues; to enhance livelihood security and well-being through improving rural communities' access to quality services.

PROACH: A key project objective was to **promote local ownership** over local development activities through **empowering community members** to set their own development objectives. This was hoped that the formation of and provision of training to Village Umbrella Committees (VUCs), Village Savings and Loan Groups, Seed Bank Groups and Marketing Groups would ensure this objective was met. The CSC – not originally part of the project – was introduced after a mid-term evaluation found that monitoring and feedback system did not allow community members sufficient scope to negotiate with either CARE staff or local service providers.

SMIHLE introduced the CSC as a means of sharing responsibility for monitoring project interventions with communities, increasing participation of project beneficiaries and improving the accountability and transparency of duty bearers.



INTERVENTION: SMIHLE was funded by AusAID through CARE Australia from 2004 to 2010. It was implemented in Lilongwe and Dowa Districts of Central Malawi, reaching approximately 30,000 households with 165,000 secondary beneficiaries. In focusing on operational practices that strengthened the delivery of services that mainstream HIV/AIDS and gender issues, focus was placed on community institutions, seed banking, village savings and loans and marketing. The CSC process were implemented from 2007-2010, with the first round lasting 2 months. The process took part in 5 phases:

Planning and Preparation: Project staff worked to raise CSC awareness with local leaders, service users and community members. Briefings were held with the Dowa and Lilongwe District Director of Planning and Development and District Commissioners, to introduce and gather support for the CSC; this was followed by a one-day orientation workshop for ten District Executive Committee members. CSC facilitators were also trained at this stage.

Conducting the CSC with Community: On Day 1, community participants were selected to ensure the inclusion of vulnerable groups, and divided into groups of women, men and local leaders. Discussions compared services received with individual entitlements. Facilitators then jointly converted issues identified into common indicators. On Day 2, groups scored services against the indicators, using a scale of 1-5, 10 or 100 depending on group preference. Final facilitators met with group representatives to consolidate scores into one community score per indicator.

Conducting the CSC with Service Providers: A similar process of issue identification and scoring was repeated with service providers; indicators identified were broadly similar to those highlighted by service users.

Interface Meeting and Action Planning: Service users and providers, plus stakeholders such as local leaders and officials, met to first present and then discuss their respective scores. Participants worked with project staff to develop joint action plans for service delivery improvement. Plans included specific actions and the body/individual responsible for implementation; timing, with total duration between 6 and 12 months; and resources. Activities included: regular meetings with local leaders to remind them of their responsibilities; timely distribution of seeds and building materials by VUCs; training and information distribution on HIV/AIDS; and monitor crop performance on a fortnightly basis.

SABLING FACTORS

Difficulty of effecting behavioural change: CARE staff noted that communities' lack of familiarity with holding service providers to account means that instilling service users with the confidence to fully engage with and challenge service users might take longer than envisaged.

Limitations of CSC monitoring: While community-level monitoring is worthwhile as a means of promoting empowerment and rights-awareness, it is insufficient as a substitute for rigorous project-level monitoring. VUCs also complained that, while they recognised the advantages of the CSC, they would prefer to rely on more simple/less time-consuming monitoring methods.

Non-integration of CSC process: Many municipalities regarded CSC-driven monitoring, evaluation and the mainstreaming of gender and HIV/AIDS as add-ons to their work as opposed to adaptive mechanisms for overall improvements in service delivery.

Limited Organisational Communication: Performance assessments of service users and providers were not reported to CARE Australia, the reasons for which are unclear. This method of holding CARE Malawi to account was thus available but not used, and learning at the senior decision-making level may have been limited as a result.



ENABLING FACTORS

- **Involvement of key local political actors:** The inclusion of the District Director of Planning and Development in several CSC processes and follow-up meetings meant that issues raised were advertised beyond the VUC level. In Dowa District, this resulted in increased investments in tree-planting, roads and pond construction.
- **VUC structures:** The CSC process benefited from the previous establishment of VUCs, who assumed significant responsibilities in action plan designs and served as focal points for community complaints, suggestions and dialogue.

SUCSESSES:

- **Improved and responsive service delivery:** CSC improved service providers' ability to respond quickly and appropriately to community demands. For example, communities were able to request earlier seed distribution, which gave them more freedom in deciding what to plant when. The CSC also prompted farmers to challenge the practice of seed management/distribution by multiple sources, which caused irregular availability and inconsistent distribution. VUCs were subsequently given sole responsibility for distributing an increased amount of seeds at agreed locations and times.
- **Community empowerment:** Many participants noted that the CSC process improved their confidence to challenge and negotiate with service providers and previously remote political authorities such as District Council members.
- **Expanded space for user-provider negotiation:** Using jointly agreed numerical scores to represent service users' opinions on performance, it became easier to communicate farmers' voices to other actors. District officials were noted as becoming more open to criticism, while greater citizen engagement within formal decentralized structures has supported community representation and consideration at the District level.

KEY LESSONS:

Prioritise short-term intensive VUC support over long-term investment: As the VUC structure proved generally sustainable, future projects should not focus on providing long term financial and technical support to individual VUCs but rather work to expose a large number of communities to the VUC formation process. This could be achieved through providing intensive support to newly formed VUCs for one year, reduced support during the second year and conducting only M&E on VUC activities thereafter.

Ensure quality facilitators: The CSC is highly dependent on the quality of individual facilitators, who should be able to extract community views accurately and without bias; overcome power relations so that all participants are heard and ensure action plans are as representative and empowering as possible. CARE provided training on the theoretical and practical aspects of CSC facilitation (such as contextual adaptation, leading constructive as opposed to antagonistic discussions, and breaking down power hierarchies) as a means of ensuring quality facilitation.