

# **Zambia-Led Prevention Initiative**

## **HIV SERVICES ORGANISATIONAL NETWORKS ANALYSIS STUDY**

*Submitted by the Population Council, Zambia  
April 2014*

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Community Participation for HIV Prevention .....	3
Objective and Aims .....	4
Methods .....	4
Sample.....	4
Study site (ZPI “communities”) selection.....	4
Identification of HIV advocacy and service organizations (network actors) .....	5
Selection of individuals to be interviewed.....	5
Data Collection and Management .....	5
Ethics .....	6
Findings .....	6
The Study Sites and Characteristics of the Organizations .....	6
Network Characteristics.....	6
Awareness of other organizations in the network .....	7
Active collaboration between the organizations .....	8
Resource sharing between the organizations.....	9
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	10
References .....	11

## Introduction

The Zambia-Led HIV Prevention Initiative (ZPI)<sup>1</sup> mobilizes community resources to contribute to a coordinated and comprehensive response to HIV. Community participation and community-owned social change for HIV prevention is core to ZPI's strategy. By engaging communities to participate in defining their needs and implementing the response to reduce new infections, ZPI aims to positively influence a range of proximal (e.g., sexual behaviors) and distal (e.g., gender norms) factors that contribute to Zambia's HIV epidemic.

But what does *community participation* actually mean? How do we know if participation is strong or weak, effective or not? Who participates and how? What facilitates or blocks participation? What participatory arrangements and structures generate the most productive collaboration, advocacy, shared action, and positive outcomes? Generally, how do we measure it? Without systematic approaches to answering such questions, our understanding and evidence of community participation is destined to be limited to heartwarming but fuzzy "success stories". However real and present, important and meaningful, participatory and community factors in international development projects to date remain inadequately described and poorly understood.

The main purpose of this study was to measure *community participation* around HIV prevention in ZPI-supported districts. To this end, we adopted social network analysis procedures to systematically assess the extent and quality of collaboration between key HIV advocacy and service organizations. The approach is based on two key assumptions: First, we assumed that local HIV advocacy and service organizations are key actors and are a reasonable way to represent community members. Second, we assumed that the connections and collaboration between the local organizations, which are important for an effective community-based HIV response, serve as reasonable proxies for participation.

## Community Participation for HIV Prevention

Although the term *community* is part of the everyday vernacular of civic action and public projects, it has been alternatively used to highlight place [1], social groupings [2], and symbolic attachments [3]. We follow a place-centered definition referring to community as a given locale where various actors live, work, volunteer, and interact with others. Data collection will thus be confined to actors operating within geographically defined spaces.

Equally commonplace but perhaps more contentious is the notion of participation. Evoking a sense of ownership and control, participation typologies tend to focus on degrees, from fully self-motivated action to passive reception of information delivered from the "top" "down" [4]. In this study we adopt a mid-range concept of "functional participation", referring to "[g]roups [which] are formed to meet predetermined objectives. Usually done after major project decisions are made, actors are initially dependent on outsiders but may become self dependent and enabling" (p 11). In this "participation as organization" formulation, the locus of action is conceived at the group or organization level. Albeit imperfectly, the "participation as organization" concept approximates ZPI's approach of promoting predetermined HIV prevention objectives by working with and through various community groups and local service organizations, with the ultimate aim of the interventions being community-led.

---

<sup>1</sup> A USAID-funded project being implemented by FHI360

Combining the two definitions, *community participation* in this study refers to a set of actors – organizations – located in shared and confined geographic space working together to achieve positive outcomes for the collective good. Through their mutual awareness, linkages and collaborative actions, these community actors are *networked*. As such, we take the strength and effectiveness of the inter-organizational networks as a good indication of community participation.

A strong and effective organizational network is one where network members are aware of one another and the expertise that each one possesses, collaborate in coordinated ways to take advantage of the whole mix of skills, and where members are able to leverage resources to improve efficiencies and outcomes to the benefit of the community they collectively serve. Defining “collaboration” broadly, from awareness to resource sharing, we therefore take inter-organizational collaboration as an indication of network effectiveness, which we assume, in turn, is a measure of community participation.

Inspired by prior research [5-7], in the present study we ascertained the strength and effectiveness of HIV organizational networks in ZPI-supported districts using social network analysis (SNA) techniques and measures suitable for assessing inter-organizational collaboration.

## Objective and Aims

The overall objective of this study was to characterize and describe collaboration of HIV advocacy and service organizations in selected ZPI-supported districts. Specific aims include:

- i. Identify and characterize HIV service groups and organizations working in the communities.
- ii. Ascertain and describe overall network properties and structure and identify potentially important internal sub-structures.
- iii. Using key network measures, describe the current inter-organizational collaborative environment in each community network, including mutual awareness of the organizations, formal agreements between the organizations, joint actions carried out by the organizations, and resource sharing among the organizations.
- iv. Compare inter-organizational collaboration and network effectiveness in districts where ZPI activities were launched in Year 1 versus in Year 3 of the project support.

## Methods

### Sample

#### Study site (ZPI “communities”) selection

We selected four ZPI-supported districts to participate in the study. In two of the districts ZPI initiated activities in Year 1 of the ZPI project and the in the other two in districts ZPI launched activities in Year 3 of the project. ZPI project staff recommended the four sites to be included in the study. These were: Chipata (Eastern province), Mpongwe (Copperbelt province), Lukulu (Western province), Senanga (Western province).

### **Identification of HIV advocacy and service organizations (network actors)**

We attempted to identify all HIV advocacy and service organizations in each of the selected districts, or smaller project sites if the district was too large. For this we generated an initial roster of all organizations known to ZPI staff and the revised and completed these rosters based on key informant interviews at the sites. The final roster of organizations was developed based on partner directories available at District AIDS Task Force (DATF) offices. All of the organizations included in the final roster were asked to participate in the study.

### **Selection of individuals to be interviewed**

We interviewed one individual from each organization. To be consistent across all the organizations, our first choice was to interview the head of the organization. If this individual was not available to be interviewed, we interviewed her/his technical or programmatic leader delegate. We did not include financial or administrative management staff in the interviews.

### **Data Collection and Management**

The interviews with organization leaders had two main parts. Part 1 included a short survey that focused on the general features of their own organization, including the type of organization and its service function, size and staffing, funding sources, and beneficiaries. We also asked questions about the organization's familiarity with ZPI and its interactions vis-à-vis the DATF. (See Part 1 of the Organizational Assessment and Network Survey Instrument in Annex 1.) Data derived from Part 1 of the interview produced a standard case-by-attribute data set, which we analyzed for descriptive outputs using Stata.

Part 2 of the interviews focused on the organization's collaborative relations with all other organizations in the network (i.e. those named on the roster). For this we administered questions using a roster format asking the participant/organization representative to provide information about their organizations' relationships with each of the other organizations on the roster. In relation to each other organization on the roster, we asked the participant questions about:

- i. Her/his knowledge and awareness of the organization's expertise
- ii. Any type of formal agreements with the organization
- iii. Active collaboration with the organization: recent, past, and desired
- iv. Frequency and type of communication that occurs with the organization
- v. Referral to and from the organization
- vi. Resource sharing with the organization, including training, materials, and technical

(See Part 2 of the instrument in Annex 2.)

Replies from the roster interviews produced an actor-by-actor matrix for each study question. Each cell of these matrices thus contains data on the nature of the relationship (its presence, absence or strength) between two pairs of actors in the network. To analyze these data we used a specialized software package, UCINET, designed to produce outputs that describe ties within the whole network and, as a proxy, the strength of the collaboration between network actors.

## Ethics

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the University of Zambia’s Biomedical Research Ethics Committee and from FHI360 Institutional Review Board.

## Findings

### The Study Sites and Characteristics of the Organizations

The ZPI monitoring and evaluation team directed us to Chipata and Mpongwe districts to represent the ZPI Year 1 launch and Lukulu and Senanga to represent the ZPI Year 3 launch. Given the large size and number of organizations working in Chipata (the provincial capital), we limited this study to organizations working in Chipata town. Annex 3 provides a complete summary of findings on each of the networks characteristics. In Table 1 below we present select findings across the four sites.

**Table 1: Select Characteristics of Organizations at Selected Sites**

	Year 1 ZPI Launch		Year 3 ZPI Launch		All sites
	Chipata	Mpongwe	Lukulu	Senanga	
# network actors	32	12	12	15	71
Familiar with ZPI	78%	33%	42%	40%	56%
Receives ZPI support					
• Funding	13%	8%	0	0	7%
• Materials	13%	8%	0	0	7%
• Training	16%	8%	8%	0	10%
• Technical assistance	19%	8%	0	7%	11%
• Any kind of support	34%	17%	8%	7%	21%
Interactions with DATF					
• Invited to last meeting	78%	92%	75%	93%	83%
• Attended last meeting	88%	82%	89%	100%	90%
• Submitted last report	68%	100%	89%	86%	81%

As one would expect familiarity with and support received from ZPI was higher in Year 1 organizations, however, apparent engagement with the DATF appears to be constant across Year 1 and Year 3 districts. Also, consistent across the four sites, the majority of organizations self-identified as “non-governmental” (55%), “community-based” (23%), or “faith-based” (21%). The number of paid staff at the organizations combined ranged from two and 80 while the number of volunteer workers ranged from 10 to 800. Sixty-five percent of all organization indicated “community mobilization” as their primary function and 61% and 47% indicated “HIV prevention” and “treatment, care and support” respectively.

### Network Characteristics

Reflecting increasing levels of collaboration, we structure our findings in this section around three themes: inter-organizational knowledge and awareness, active collaboration, and resource sharing. Four network properties [8] are pertinent for understanding these different levels of collaboration:

- **Density** refers to the proportion of all possible dyadic ties between pairs of actors within a given network. The potential for rapid diffusion of information and better access to community resources is greater in high **density** networks.
- **Distance** captures indirect relationships. For example, the distance between adjacent actors is one (a single tie connects the two). For two actors who are linked via other actors, the **distance** measure indicates the total number of ties (in-between steps) it would take to reach each other. Greater distances between actors may hamper information flow and sharing.
- **Transitivity** can be understood as the tendency among two nodes to be connected if they share a mutual tie. It is proportional to the ratio of the number of triangles over the total number of connected triples. Compared to dyads, relationships between groups of three actors allow for broader range of ties between actors and thus represent a good indicator of how “networked” a group of actors are. In the findings presented below, our **transitivity** measure is the percentage of all possible triangles with two legs which have three legs, meaning, if A is tied to B and B is tied to C, then C is tied to A.
- **Cliques** refers to clusters of three or more actors who have direct ties to each other in the clique. With their high degree of connectedness, inter-organizational **cliques** have the potential to be high performing and influential.

Below we use these measures to compare the degree of inter-organizational connection at the different levels of collaboration (awareness, active collaboration, resource sharing) and across the ZPI Year 1 and Year 3 initiation sites.

### Awareness of other organizations in the network

Table 2 summarizes findings on our key inter-organizational awareness question. Overall, in all four districts the organizational leaders had fairly high awareness of the other organizations in the community. Inter-organizational awareness levels were highest in Senanga with 81% of all possible awareness ties between actors reported by the Senanga respondents. It is also noteworthy that respondents from Senanga reported the highest interactions with the DATF, although we cannot confirm whether there is a relationship between this finding and the relatively high level of inter-organizational awareness in the district. Consistent with the density value, Senanga also had the smallest average distance between actors, a high percentage of triads, and a relatively large number of cliques.

**Table 2: Connections on Question: *Is your organization aware of this [Actor] organization’s area of expertise?***

	Year 1 ZPI Launch		Year 3 ZPI Launch	
	Chipata	Mpongwe	Lukulu	Senanga
Density	71%	65%	66%	81%
Avg distance	1.27	1.37	1.34	1.19
Transitivity	56%	48%	47%	61%
# of cliques	102	8	6	29

One might expect higher density values for Chipata given the large number of cliques in the network although the higher number of organizations in this network (and the difficulty of all organizations being direction connected to each other) may have influenced this value. Surprisingly, we found no discernible differences in inter-organizational awareness between ZPI Year1 and Year 3 initiation sites. Programmatically it may be useful to examine more closely the nature of the cliques and the organizations that form them and the way these groupings influenced inter-organizational awareness and information sharing within each network.

## Active collaboration between the organizations

Compared to inter-organizational awareness, active collaboration between the organizations in all four sites was low. Table 3 presents findings on active collaboration as measured by the same four indicators (density, distance, transitivity and number of cliques) chosen for this study. Apart from Senanga, very few or none of the organizations in the four sites reported having formal relationship agreements with any of the other organizations in their network. However, across all sites, between 11-20% reported conducting ‘any collaborative activity’ – including community mobilization, training or other activity – presumably based on *ad hoc* versus formal or long-standing arrangements.

**Table 3: Connections on Question: *Does your organization have a valid signed formal agreement with this [Actor]?***

		Year 1 ZPI Launch		Year 3 ZPI Launch	
		Chipata	Mpongwe	Lukulu	Senanga
<i>Does your organization have a valid signed formal agreement with [Actor]?</i>	Density	<1%	2.3%	0	7.6%
<i>Has your organization collaborated [Actor] in the past (more than three months ago)?</i>	Density	20%	11%	13%	24%
	Avg distance	2.05	1.83	1.15	1.88
	Transitivity	12%	11%	6%	14%
	# of cliques	3	0	0	0
<i>Have you recently participated in joint community mobilization/ outreach event or training with [Actor] within the last 3 months?</i>	Density	20%	24%	24%	25%
	Avg distance	2.02	2.24	1.77	2.21
	Transitivity	18%	14%	9%	15%
	# of cliques	9	0	0	0
<i>Would you like your organization to collaborate with [Actor] in the future?</i>	Density	49%	39%	51%	53%
	Avg distance	1.51	1.71	1.53	1.34
	Transitivity	29%	22%	34%	35%
	# of cliques	49	3	7	11

Most striking in these findings are the differences between the organizations’ actual and desired active collaboration. Compared to the 109 *awareness* cliques found in Chipata, for example, only 3 and 9 past and recent *active collaboration* cliques were found in data. In Senanga, no *active collaboration* cliques were found compared to 29 in the *awareness* matrix.

Significantly, on all of the measures and in all the districts the desire to collaborate appears to be quite high. Except for the case of Lukulu, desired collaboration density values were more than double those

for recent active collaboration. Average distances between organizations are also substantially smaller in the desired collaboration responses while transitivity and the number of cliques increased.

There were no discernible differences in inter-organizational collaboration between ZPI Year1 and Year 3 initiation sites.

## Resource sharing between the organizations

We asked three resource-sharing questions related to whether organizations had either given resources to, or received resources from, other organizations in their network. We focused on three types of resources: training, materials, and technical support. Table 4 shows findings on density values for resource sharing across the four sites. With the exception of an aberration in Lukulu (regarding the receipt of technical assistance), resource sharing between the organizations was very low in all three areas. Again, with the exception of the Lukulu technical support value, giving and receiving of some form of material support was marginally higher than for trainings or technical support, although the small values make it difficult to interpret any real trends in the data. The high density of technical support reported in Lukulu warrants further investigation to better understand whether this was diffuse or centralized phenomenon. That is, whether all organizations reported receiving technical support from the same or a range of other organizations in their network.

**Table 4: Density Values on Resource Sharing Questions**

	Year 1 ZPI Launch		Year 3 ZPI Launch	
	Chipata	Mpongwe	Lukulu	Senanga
<b>Giving:</b>				
Training	1.3%	1.5%	0	<1%
Material	2.6%	9.1%	8.3%	3.8%
Technical support	1.7%	2.3%	1.5%	4.3%
<b>Receiving:</b>				
Training	1.1%	1.5%	0	1.9%
Material	2.5%	3.0%	3.0%	2.4%
Technical support	<1%	2.3%	81%	<1%

There were no discernible differences in inter-organizational resource sharing between ZPI Year1 and Year 3 initiation sites.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall findings from this study show that network connections amongst organizations involved in HIV prevention do exist, but that they are not 'high functioning'. Although inter-organizational awareness in the study sites was relatively high, the data demonstrated a low density of active collaboration and a near absence of formal inter-organizational ties. While formal agreements may not be necessary to achieve higher rates of active collaboration, it seems reasonable to assume that resource sharing – particularly material and training resources for which individual organizations must be accountable – would be assisted by this type of collaboration.

Given the relatively high rates of intra-network awareness, the low rates of active collaboration across the four sites do not appear to be related to a lack of information. Further investigation is warranted to understand what political, capacity-related or other programmatic barriers may be hindering the translation of *awareness* cliques into a higher functioning network of active collaborators. One potential barrier may be certain target-related reporting requirements that block collaborative activities where there is a perceived risk of organizations' double reporting' or being unable to attribute certain outcomes to certain activities.

While more organizations in Year 1 sites compared to Year 3 sites confirmed ZPI support with funding, materials, training and technical assistance, there were no major differences in between Year 1 and Year 3 sites on any of the other indicators, including: interactions of the organizations with DATF, inter-organizational awareness, inter-organizational collaboration, and inter-organizational resource sharing.

Together these findings suggest important programming gaps and opportunities to strengthen community participations. One way to address identified gaps is by explicitly undertake a network building role to facilitate better interconnectedness among like-mined actors. For example, identifying an "anchor" NGO who's scope of work is to coordinate joint actions in case of multiple groups.

## References

1. Willmott, P., *Social Networks, Informal Care and Public Policy*. London 1986, London: Policy Studies Institute.
2. Crow, G. and G. Allan, *Community Life. An introduction to local social relations* 1994, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
3. Cohen, A., *The Symbolic Construction of Community* 1985, London: Tavistock.
4. United Nations, *Case Studies in Community Participation*, 2009, ESCAP Publications Office: New York.
5. Harris, J., D. Luke, R. Burke, and N. Mueller, *Seeing the forest and the trees: Using network analysis to develop an organizational blueprint of state tobacco control systems* *Social Science and Medicine*, 2008. **67**: p. 1669-1678.
6. Kwait, J., T. Valente, and D. Celentano, *Interorganizational Relationships Among HIV/AIDS Service Organizations in Baltimore: A Network Analysis*. *Journal of Urban Health*. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 2001. **78**(3): p. 468-487.
7. Valente, T., K. Fujimoto, P. Palmer, and S. Tanjasiri, *Network Assessment of Community-Based Participatory Research: Linking Communities and Universities to Reduce Cancer Disparities* *American Journal of Public Health*, 2010. **100**(7): p. 1319-1325.
8. Hanneman, R. and M. Riddle. *Introduction to social network methods*. 2005; Available from: <http://faculty.ucr.edu/~hannerman/>.

<b>Community Participation in HIV Prevention: An Inter-Organization Network Analysis in the Zambia-Led Prevention Initiative's (ZPI) Intervention Areas</b>	<b>Version 02 May 2013</b>
<b>Questionnaire for Organizational Leaders</b>	
InterviewDate: <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	InterviewerID : <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
OrgID: <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Completed <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> 1 Refused <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> 2
Reason for refusal( if refused)	

<b>PART I: ORGANIZATION CHARACTERISTICS</b>																	
No.	Question	Response															
101	What is the name of your organization?	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>															
102	What is your official job title?	<hr/> <hr/>															
103	What type of organization is this?	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: right; padding-right: 10px;">Public</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right; padding-right: 10px;">Private</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right; padding-right: 10px;">Non-governmental org.</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right; padding-right: 10px;">Civil society/Community-based org.</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right; padding-right: 10px;">Religious/Faith-based org.</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td> </tr> </table>	Public		1	Private		2	Non-governmental org.		3	Civil society/Community-based org.		4	Religious/Faith-based org.		5
Public		1															
Private		2															
Non-governmental org.		3															
Civil society/Community-based org.		4															
Religious/Faith-based org.		5															

104	Is this organization familiar with the Zambia-Led Prevention Initiative (ZPI) project?	<p style="text-align: right;">Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No <b>[skip to Q106]</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Don't know <b>[skip to Q106]</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 99</p>
105	If yes, has your organization received any of the following types of support directly from ZPI <u>within the past 6 months</u> ( <b>select all that apply</b> )?	<p style="text-align: right;">Funding <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Materials <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Training <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Technical assistance <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Received no support <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p>
106	What is the total number of paid staff working for the organization in this district?	<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> paid staff</p>
107	What is the total number of unpaid staff or volunteers working for the organization in this district?	<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/><input type="text"/> unpaid staff/volunteers</p>
108	What is the primary function of the organization ( <b>select all that apply</b> )?	<p style="text-align: right;">Prevention <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Treatment, care, and support <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Community mobilization/outreach <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Advocacy <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Policy &amp; planning <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> 6</p> <hr/> <hr/>

109	Please list the top 5 sources of funding or income for this organization.	1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____
110	Who are the main beneficiaries of the functions or services provided by this organization ( <b>select all that apply</b> )?	Men (>25 years) <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Women (>25 years) <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Youth (15-24 years) <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Children (<15 years) <input type="checkbox"/> 4
111	What is the total number of beneficiaries that this organization serves in this district?	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> beneficiaries
112	Was your organization invited to last quarter's District AIDS Task Force (DATF) stakeholders' meeting?  <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No [ <b>skip to Table 1</b> ] <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Don't know [ <b>skip to Table 1</b> ] <input type="checkbox"/> 99
113	If yes, did someone from your organization attend last quarter's DATF stakeholders' meeting?  <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 99
114	Did your organization submit last quarter's SARF to the DATF office?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 99
115	Not including the last stakeholders' meeting and submitting the SARF, has your organization had any business-related interactions with the DATF office <u>within the past 3 months</u> ?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 99

**PART II: COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

**Table 1: Knowledge and Perceptions**

Below is a roster of all organizations active in your community. Please answer " yes," "no," or "I am not familiar with this organization" to the following questions. Circle the number corresponding to the response.

- 0 I am not familiar with this organization
- 1 Yes
- 2 No

	Is your organization aware of this organization's area of expertise?		Is this organization's area of expertise critical for your organization to succeed in its work?		
	a		b		
1. Bwalo Global Development Trust	0	1	0	1	2
2. Family Health Trust (FHT)	0	1	0	1	2
3. God's Faithful Fruitful Ministries International	0	1	0	1	2
4. Holy Saviour CHBC	0	1	0	1	2
5. Kafue Child Development Agency	0	1	0	1	2
6. Kafue Gospel & Community Development Organization	0	1	0	1	2
7. Network of Zambian People Living with HIV & AIDS (NZP+)	0	1	0	1	2
8. Pride Community Health Organization	0	1	0	1	2
9. Programme Urban Self-Help (PUSH)	0	1	0	1	2

10. Rise Community AID Programme (RICAP)	0	1	0	1	2
11. The Salvation Army	0	1	0	1	2
12. Women on the Move	0	1	0	1	2

**Table 2: Agreements & Recent Collaboration**

Below is a roster of all organizations active in your community. For each organization, please indicate if you have engaged in the selected forms of joint planning and coordinated action at least once within the past 3 months. Circle the number corresponding to the response. Circle "0" if the respondent indicated that they are not familiar with the organization in Table 1.

0 I am not familiar with this organization

1 Yes

2 No

	Does your org. have a valid signed formal agreement with this org.?			Participated in joint community mobilization/ outreach events			Participated in joint training events			Participated in other form of collaboration (describe)			
	a			b			c			describe			
	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	
1. Bwalo Global Development Trust													
2. Family Health Trust (FHT)													
3. God's Faithful Fruitful Ministries International													
4. Holy Saviour CHBC													
5. Kafue Child Development Agency													
6. Kafue Gospel & Community Development Organization													
7. Network of Zambian People Living with HIV & AIDS (NZP+)													
8. Pride Community Health Organization													

	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
9. Programme Urban Self-Help (PUSH)												
10. Rise Community AID Programme (RICAP)	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
11. The Salvation Army	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
12. Women on the Move	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
<b>Table 3: Past and Future Collaborations</b>												

Below is a roster of all organizations active in your community. For each organization, please indicate "yes" or "no". Circle the number corresponding to the response. Circle "0" if the respondent indicated that they are not familiar with the organization in Table 1. Circle "2" if the respondent indicated that they are currently collaborating with the organization in Table 2. **Only ask this question about organizations that the respondent indicated that they are not currently working with in Table 2.**

- 0 I am not familiar with this organization
- 1 Yes
- 2 No

	Has your org. collaborated with this org. in the <u>past</u> (more than 3 months ago)?			Would your org. like to collaborate with this org. in the <u>future</u> ?		
	a			b		
1. Bwalo Global Development Trust	0	1	2	0	1	2
2. Family Health Trust (FHT)	0	1	2	0	1	2
3. God's Faithful Fruitful Ministries International	0	1	2	0	1	2
4. Holy Saviour CHBC	0	1	2	0	1	2
5. Kafue Child Development Agency	0	1	2	0	1	2
6. Kafue Gospel & Community Development Organization	0	1	2	0	1	2

7. Network of Zambian People Living with HIV & AIDS (NZP+)	0	1	2	0	1	2
8. Pride Community Health Organization	0	1	2	0	1	2
9. Programme Urban Self-Help (PUSH)	0	1	2	0	1	2
10. Rise Community AID Programme (RICAP)	0	1	2	0	1	2
11. The Salvation Army	0	1	2	0	1	2
12. Women on the Move	0	1	2	0	1	2

**Q 201** Are there any barriers preventing you from working effectively with other organizations in your community. If yes, please describe them.

---



---



---

**Table 4: Communication**

Below is a roster of all organizations active in your community. For each organization, please indicate if you have engaged in the selected forms of communication for business purposes at least once within the past 3 months. Circle the number corresponding to the response. Circle "0" if the respondent indicated that they are not familiar with the organization in Table 1.

0 I am not familiar with this organization

1 Yes

2 No

	Met in person for business-related meetings (not including DATF meetings)			Exchanged business-related emails			Exchanged business-related phone calls		
	a	b	c	a	b	c	a	b	c
1. Bwalo Global Development Trust	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
2. Family Health Trust (FHT)	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
3. God's Faithful Fruitful Ministries International	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
4. Holy Saviour CHBC	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
5. Kafue Child Development Agency	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
6. Kafue Gospel & Community Development Organization	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
7. Network of Zambian People Living with HIV & AIDS (NZP+)	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
8. Pride Community Health Organization	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
9. Programme Urban Self-Help (PUSH)	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
10. Rise Community AID Programme (RICAP)	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
11. The Salvation Army	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
12. Women on the Move	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2

**Table 5.1: Referrals - Giving**

Below is a roster of all organizations active in your community. For each organization, please indicate if you have sent that organization a referral **at least once within the past 3 months** and the purpose of that referral. Circle the number corresponding to the response. Circle "0" if the respondent indicated that they are not familiar with the organization in Table 1.

- 0 I am not familiar with this organization
- 1 Yes
- 2 No

	Sent referral to organization			Purpose of referral
	a			
1. Bwalo Global Development Trust	0	1	2	
2. Family Health Trust (FHT)	0	1	2	
3. God's Faithful Fruitful Ministries International	0	1	2	
4. Holy Saviour CHBC	0	1	2	
5. Kafue Child Development Agency	0	1	2	
6. Kafue Gospel & Community Development Organization	0	1	2	
7. Network of Zambian People Living with HIV & AIDS (NZP+)	0	1	2	
8. Pride Community Health Organization	0	1	2	
9. Programme Urban Self-Help (PUSH)	0	1	2	
10. Rise Community AID Programme (RICAP)	0	1	2	
11. The Salvation Army	0	1	2	
12. Women on the Move	0	1	2	

**Table 5.2: Referrals - Receiving**

Below is a roster of all organizations active in your community. For each organization, please indicate if you have received a referral from that organization a referral at least once within the past 3 months and the purpose of that referral. Circle the number corresponding to the response. Circle "0" if the respondent indicated that they are not familiar with the organization in Table 1.

- 0 I am not familiar with this organization
- 1 Yes
- 2 No

	Received referral from organization			Purpose of referral
	a	b	c	
1. Bwalo Global Development Trust	0	1	2	
2. Family Health Trust (FHT)	0	1	2	
3. God's Faithful Fruitful Ministries International	0	1	2	
4. Holy Saviour CHBC	0	1	2	
5. Kafue Child Development Agency	0	1	2	
6. Kafue Gospel & Community Development Organization	0	1	2	
7. Network of Zambian People Living with HIV & AIDS (NZP+)	0	1	2	
8. Pride Community Health Organization	0	1	2	
9. Programme Urban Self-Help (PUSH)	0	1	2	
10. Rise Community AID Programme (RICAP)	0	1	2	
11. The Salvation Army	0	1	2	
12. Women on the Move	0	1	2	

Annex 2.

Org ID: \_\_\_\_\_

	AGGREGATES			ZPI YEAR 1		ZPI YEAR 3	
	All Sites	Year Sites 1	Year Sites 3	Chipata	Mpongwe	Lukulu	Senanga
<b>No. network actors</b>	71	44	27	32	12	12	15
<b>q103: Type of organization</b>							
Public	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.13
Private	0.03	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.00
Non-governmental	0.55	0.50	0.63	0.56	0.33	0.58	0.67
Community-based	0.23	0.30	0.11	0.28	0.33	0.17	0.07
Faith-based	0.21	0.23	0.19	0.19	0.33	0.25	0.13
<b>q104: Familiar with ZPI</b>	0.56	0.66	0.41	0.78	0.33	0.42	0.40
<b>q105: ZPI support</b>							
Any support	0.21	0.30	0.07	0.34	0.17	0.08	0.07
Funding	0.07	0.11	0.00	0.13	0.08	0.00	0.00
Materials	0.07	0.11	0.00	0.13	0.08	0.00	0.00
Training	0.10	0.14	0.04	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.00
Technical support	0.11	0.16	0.04	0.19	0.08	0.00	0.07
<b>q106: No. paid staff</b>							
Median	2	3	0	3	1	0	0
Min	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Max	80	80	20	80	12	4	20

<b>q107: No. volunteers</b>							
Median	10	12.5	10	16.5	12	12.5	10
Min	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Max	800	800	600	800	75	120	600
<b>q108: Org's primary function</b>							
Prevention	0.61	0.75	0.37	0.84	0.50	0.33	0.40
Treatment, care, support	0.47	0.36	0.63	0.34	0.42	0.58	0.67
Community mobilization	0.65	0.70	0.56	0.81	0.42	0.50	0.60
Advocacy	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.08	0.40
Policy & planning	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.13
OVC support	0.38	0.48	0.22	0.41	0.67	0.17	0.27
<b>q110: Main beneficiaries</b>							
Men (>25 years)	0.77	0.80	0.74	0.78	0.83	0.92	0.60
Women (>25 years)	0.9	0.91	0.89	0.91	0.92	0.92	0.87
Youth (15-24 years)	0.93	0.95	0.89	0.97	0.92	1.00	0.80
Children (<15 years)	0.77	0.86	0.63	0.81	1.00	0.83	0.47
<b>q111: No. beneficiaries</b>							
Median	680	1,450	300	1,750	915	228	400
Min	4	15	4	15	30	4	15
Max	>99,999	>99,999	10,000	>99,999	19,500	9,000	10,000
<b>q112: Invited to last DATF meeting</b>	0.83	0.82	0.85	0.78	0.92	0.75	0.93
<b>q113: Attended last DATF meeting</b>	0.90	0.86	0.96	0.88	0.82	0.89	1.00
<b>q114: Submitted last DATF report</b>	0.81	0.78	0.87	0.68	1.00	0.89	0.86
<b>q115: Other recent DATF interaction</b>	0.76	0.83	0.65	0.92	0.64	0.56	0.71