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EHPSA is in essence a programme that deals with evidence into action. It has been designed to achieve this goal by working on supply and demand simultaneously;

– Generating new evidence & filling knowledge gaps
– Stimulating engagement between stakeholders to increase demand for evidence and to encourage debate

EHPSA delivers on the evidence into action targets through various modalities, underpinned by early, continuous and responsible engagement between policy makers and academics along the research continuum.
### EHPSA Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Research</th>
<th>Adolescent Portfolio</th>
<th>MSM Portfolio</th>
<th>Prisoner Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Combination prevention packages</td>
<td>• Prevention for HIV+ adolescents</td>
<td>• SRH packages</td>
<td>• Treatment as Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevention for HIV+ adolescents</td>
<td>• PrEP &amp; GBV</td>
<td>• STI burden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Bank Evaluations</td>
<td>• Demand side incentives in Swaziland (VMMC) &amp; Malawi (school attendance)</td>
<td>• MSM couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ART adherence in SA and mHealth trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>• PREP uptake &amp; adherence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critical Reviews</td>
<td>• Future of SBCC in the era of Tasp</td>
<td>• Regional &amp; trends analysis on access to services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregation and definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Analysis – HIV services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Analysis – routine surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contextual Analysis</td>
<td>• 3 x Cross Cutting: Resource Allocation for KPs, Research Priorities for KPs, and Case Studies on how change happens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RRIF Country Context and Policy Window analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### EHPSA Evidence into Action Strategies

- **Stakeholder Engagement**
  - RRIF studies SE, Fora, Symposia, Fellowship & Board
- **Tracking and Learning**
  - Examples of influence & wider EHPSA impact
- **Knowledge Management and Translation**
  - Open source journal articles, evidence briefs, learning case studies
- **Dissemination**
  - Conferences, publications planning & EHPSA conference, EIA & routine communications

---

### Sphere of Influence

Influencing people, networks, institutional contexts and policy ideas in the ESA region

### Contributing to

EHPSA Outcome

HIV prevention strategies for key vulnerable populations (adolescents, LGBTI, prisoners) are in place and based upon evidence.
This is why is difficult to influence policy

Source: Subroto, understanding complexities in public policy making
The availability and use of high quality credible evidence in policy and decision making enhances the quality of the debates, offers “neutral” perspectives, and this improves the quality of the policy & practice formulation and enhances the policy & practice outcomes, which improves the lives of people.
• Research clearly matters, however there remains no systematic understanding of what, when, why and how research feeds into HIV prevention policies

• Evidence Uptake: the processes that allow/disallow research to influence policy-makers horizons, policy development, declared public policy regimes, funding patters and policy implementation or practice (Lindquist, 2003).
The policy development process is complex, multifactorial and non-linear, involving multiple stakeholders with different interests, which all produce and use evidence as a tool for influencing throughout the process. No matter how small one’s role is in an organisation, all stakeholders contribute to policy making.
Effective evidence informed decision making should combine different types of evidence in a balanced manner:

- Too much research – technocratic policy making
- Too much data – analysis paralyses
- Too much citizen knowledge – populist approaches to policy making
- Too much focus on what works – slow innovation