

A Thousand Small Sanities

The Moral
Adventure of a
Technical
Intervention



“The legal status of KVPs in Tanzania are a hurdle to effective program implementation. Fear of arrest and mistreatment means crimes against KVPs are unlikely to be reported and keeps them from seeking treatment near police stations. This is concerning now that KVPs must procure services in centralized facilities rather than in community drop-in centers.”

1. **Program Driven Advocacy:** SAUTI has proven exceptionally adept at responding to the difficult operating environment created by the politicization of KVP issues.
2. **The Progressive Dividend of a Technical Focus: A Spectrum of Awareness**
 - i. Framing the case for KVP intervention in terms of epidemic control helps defuse resistance in an environment where KVP services are highly politicized. NIMR partnership has helped. There is a spectrum of awareness across national, regional and local stakeholders.
 - ii. KVP centered services are institutionalized in guidelines, job aids and tools such as registers and forms. From the national to the LGA levels and GOT facilities, there is a recognition that targeting KPs is key to controlling the epidemic.
 - iii. CSOs confirm that the knowledge, skills and modalities of service delivery cultivated through participation in SAUTI are factors that strengthen prospects for sustaining services post-activity.
3. **The Empowerment Dividend of the Programming Model: LGBTQ+ in Community**
 - i. Mobilizing a volunteer workforce from peers and group formation are key to reach.
 - ii. There is a substantial empowerment dividend that is more pronounced with more interventions e.g., reported improvements in parenting, reconciliation in families, improved self-worth and esteem, the assumption of leadership roles.
4. **The Unexpected Dividend of Exposure: Mainstreaming**
 - i. SAUTI adapted to formal facilities replacing drop-in centers. SAUTI worked with GOT facilities, sensitizing them to KP friendly treatment care practices.
 - ii. This may improve prospects for sustainability as facilities take on these roles.

Does inclusive data lead or follow data users?

i.e., Can researchers put diverse/inclusive gender/sexuality categories into studies before data users (policy makers/donors/implementing partners) are ready for it, or does research follow an enabling/receptive policy/practice environment?

1. The stakes are beyond the sway of technical practice
2. Data supports the lead taken by policy, funding, programming and advocacy
3. Data follows utility
4. Data ethics need to be vigilantly applied
5. Everything contributes, gains are incremental