



**WORLD FISH CENTRE**  
**2<sup>ND</sup> POLICY ADVISORY GROUP**  
**FISHERIES & HIV/AIDS IN AFRICA**  
**COTONOU, BENIN**  
**15 – 18 MARCH 2010**

- ❖ EALP: broad-based partnership
- ❖ Constituted of AMREF, EAC, LVBC, LVFO, IUCEA & 5 EAC Partner States
- ❖ Focuses on: fishing communities, agro-plantation workers (both L. Victoria Basin); university students (across EAC region)
- ❖ Also works in partnership with 20 universities, and 9 agricultural plantations

- ❖ Designed to respond to HIV risks and vulnerabilities among mobile populations in the L. Victoria Basin in E. Africa
- ❖ Broad aims include:
  - ❖ Strengthening regional coordination of HIV & AIDS responses
  - ❖ Harmonizing policies, standards, practices
  - ❖ Strengthening mobile population networks

- ❖ Targeted interventions
  - ❖ Identification of HIV risks, vulnerabilities
  - ❖ Clear focus on 3 mobile populations
- ❖ Strengthening linkages
  - ❖ at sector, country, & regional levels
- ❖ Evidence based interventions
- ❖ Entrenched ownership
  - ❖ by govts., sectors; & specific institutions
- ❖ Structured policy influencing process

- ❖ Support and goodwill at the highest level
  - ❖ At least 3 reports on EALP progress to Councils of Ministers every year
  - ❖ Broad representation in each country from key ministries
- ❖ Catalyst for other regional programs
  - ❖ Public Health & Sanitation dept: LVBC
  - ❖ EAC HIV&AIDS strategic Plan

- ❖ Main being problem: lack of reliable data on fishing communities, & other mobile populations
- ❖ Thought to be vulnerable, & at heightened risk but hardly any data – national or regional to confirm that perception
- ❖ Available data: not comparable across countries
- ❖ Difficult to plan or program – risks & vulnerabilities not sufficiently understood

- ❖ EALP conducting HIV sero-behavioral studies across 3 populations of focus
  - ❖ 20 universities, 9 plantations, about 100+ fish landing sites
  - ❖ HIV blood testing, behaviour, policies, & services
- ❖ Initial reluctance by governments
  - ❖ seen as duplicating national HIV studies
  - ❖ fear by governments: quality; loss of control
- ❖ SOPs and protocols: different in each country
- ❖ Sampling design: major problem

- ❖ Lobbying at policy & technical levels
  - ❖ Permanent secretaries, heads of NACs, MOH
  - ❖ Mid level experts in government
- ❖ Formation of National Technical Teams (NTT)
  - ❖ Specialists in key govt. ministries & national research institutions
  - ❖ Design & quality control responsibilities
- ❖ Entrenching government ownership



# Result

- ❖ **Studies now completed in 19 universities, 1 more almost**
- ❖ **Plantation studies completed in Uganda**
- ❖ **Fisheries about to commence, Uganda & TZ**
- ❖ **From universities: highly risky sexual behavior: concurrent sexual partnerships**
- ❖ **Condom use high in most universities**
- ❖ **Governments very keen on study results: awaited for national policy & planning**
- ❖ **Study indicators to be incorporated into national and regional M&E HIV&AIDS indicators**

- ❖ Standardized methodology (parameters) for assessing HIV risk/vulnerability useful
  - ❖ allows uniformity in programming approaches
  - ❖ eases comparison of what works, in which contexts, & why
- ❖ Anecdotal evidence: food security has both gender & power dimensions among fishing communities
  - ❖ food insecurity drives women and the young to the fish landing sites, esp. those affected by HIV&AIDS
  - ❖ Controlled access to fisheries resources, heightens risk & vulnerability to HIV and AIDS

- ❖ Issue of unsustainable exploitation of fisheries resources
  - ❖ Threaten food security and nutritional status of those affected by HIV&AIDS
  - ❖ Pressure on limited fishing resources available (export trade, large commercial dealers)
- ❖ EALP pilot interventions
  - ❖ alternative livelihood strategies factored in by LVFO

- ❖ Working across countries difficult
  - ❖ politics, national sensitivities
  - ❖ Institutional niche building
  - ❖ Opportunism
- ❖ “Project mindset” ill-suited for multi-partnership regional projects/programs
  - ❖ Defined budget, schedules, clearly understood stakeholder (shifting) interests at the onset?
  - ❖ Required: donor flexibility; flexible organizational systems and structures
  - ❖ Capacity to strike compromises: thinking win-win