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Acronyms

ADR  Alternative dispute resolution
AHURO  Action for Human Rights Organization
AIDS  Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
ART  Antiretroviral therapy
ARVs  Antiretroviral drugs
CBOs  Community-based organizations
CTMS  Case tracking management system
FBOs  Faith-based organizations
GROOTS  Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood
GWED-G  Gulu Women Empowerment and Globalization
HBC  Home-based caregiver
HIV  Human immunodeficiency virus
HRVs  Human rights volunteers
ICRW  International Center for Research on Women
IJM  International Justice Mission
KELIN  Kenya Legal and Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDS
LC  Local Councilperson (in Uganda)
LEMU  Land and Equity Movement Uganda
M&E  Monitoring and evaluation
NGOs  Non-governmental organizations
PLHIV  Person/people living with HIV
RATs  Rapid action teams
SWID  Slum Women’s Initiative for Development
UCOBAC  Uganda Community Based Association for Child Welfare
UGANET  Uganda Network on Law, Ethics and HIV/AIDS
ULA  Uganda Land Alliance
VCT  Volunteer testing and counseling
WPIR  Women’s property and inheritance rights
YWAP  Young Widows Advancement Program
M any in the field of the public health and international development hypothesize that strengthening women’s property and inheritance rights (WPIR) may reduce susceptibility to HIV and enable households to better mitigate the economic, physical, and emotional consequences of HIV, particularly in high prevalence countries. A growing body of qualitative and programmatic evidence suggests that programs addressing both WPIR and HIV\(^1\) are more effective at helping women and families alleviate the consequences of HIV compared with programs that address WPIR or HIV alone. However, there is a lack of quantitative evidence to support this assumption.

To better understand the effectiveness of combination programming at this intersection, more investment is needed in data collection and monitoring to document and evaluate the impact of programs that address both WPIR and HIV. A critical first step is having a clear understanding of current programmatic and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) efforts. This compendium aims to fill this gap by reviewing programs working at the intersection of HIV and WPIR in Kenya and Uganda, countries that have been heavily affected by the HIV epidemic and subsequently are experiencing a high occurrence of property grabbing and disinheritance from widows and orphans.

The compendium includes descriptions and analysis of the 11 identified organizations and two in-depth case studies. Though not meant to be exhaustive, the compendium represents the depth and breadth of current programming in Kenya and Uganda that includes both WPIR and HIV. We summarize current programmatic and M&E approaches, discuss strengths and challenges of each, and provide recommendations for next steps.

**Key Findings**

Among the programs reviewed:

- Organizations addressing laws and rights seldom interact with those addressing the clinical and behavioral aspects of HIV. The lack of data describing the influence of WPIR on HIV is due principally to the siloed nature of these two professions and perspectives.

- When local organizations recognized the need to provide both HIV and WPIR services, the recognition typically emerged from the stories of their clients. For organizations initially involved in home-based HIV care, the frequency of property grabbing from women living with HIV and orphans became readily apparent. Conversely, for those working on WPIR, it was observed that widows and orphans affected by HIV made up a large percentage of their client population. Attempts to integrate services addressing WPIR and HIV varied widely and were limited among all of organizations included in this review.

- HIV programming focused mainly on assisting individual clients to test and seek care and treatment and providing emotional and psychosocial support. Organizations either provided these services directly or referred clients to existing HIV service organizations. WPIR programming focused mainly on the identification and successful resolution of property grabbing cases, typically through a combination of legal education and awareness raising

---

\(^1\) This could include programs that address HIV at both the individual (biological and behavioral) and/or the structural (social and contextual) levels.
efforts about WPIR in the community, training on documentation needed to prevent property grabbing, and mediation assistance facilitated by either paralegals or lawyers.

- Most programs lacked routine and rigorous data collection and evaluation, often because implementers did not have sufficient resources or technical capacity. For those organizations able to monitor their activities, most captured and stored the data for HIV and WPIR separately. There was only one example of a database that could produce basic reports combing the HIV and WPIR monitoring data. In addition, none of the measures collected allow for direct assessment of the link between WPIR and HIV.

- Most programs found it difficult to secure funding to integrate HIV and WPIR activities, stating that donors tended to fund one area or the other, but typically not both. Another challenge expressed was the difficulty in raising funds to appropriately monitor and evaluate programming at the intersection of HIV and WPIR.

**Key Recommendations**

- Stakeholders principally interested in WPIR and others principally interested in HIV should come together for discussions about their respective interests, motivations, resources, and goals. This may help break down siloed efforts and pave the road for a fruitful collaboration.

- There is a need to identify a small set of indicators that all organizations working in WPIR and HIV could collect in a routine manner that would not be excessively resource-intensive. These indicators measuring the intersection between WPIR and HIV could be integrated into existing, supported, M&E efforts and added to population-based surveys, such as the Demographic and Health Survey, as appropriate.

- Programs should seek to include the local community as much as possible to implement, advocate for, or help sustain improvements in the successful mediation of property grabbing cases. Community involvement at all levels is important in efforts to improve WPIR. This approach emphasizes participation, builds networks and leadership capacity, and increases women’s role in local government. National policy and government involvement are also important to sustaining and scaling up combined HIV and property rights programming.

- Programs working on WPIR and HIV should seek to capture data on gender-based and sexual violence experienced by clients during and several months after the successful resolution of property grabbing cases. A few programs noted that experiences of violence appeared to increase as a result of the success of programs at keeping women and orphans on their land. Currently, most organizations stop collecting data as soon as a case is resolved. Further investigation through formal qualitative research is also warranted.
Securing women’s property and inheritance rights (WPIR) may reduce their vulnerability to many crises, including HIV and AIDS. Evidence suggests that where women’s rights to property are upheld, women acting as heads and/or primary caregivers of HIV and AIDS-affected households are better able to manage the impact of AIDS [1]. Additionally, in the absence of shelter, food, and a viable livelihood, many widows and their children face destitution and may engage in risky sexual behavior for the sake of survival, furthering the spread of HIV [2]. Despite the proven and hypothesized benefits of securing WPIR, there are many ways in which these rights may come under threat. The AIDS epidemic has contributed to rising numbers of female-headed households, and there are many examples of widows who have lost their property—land, housing, and even other assets like animals, furniture, or pots and pans—in disputes with members of their deceased spouse’s extended family.

Women in sub-Saharan Africa have been particularly affected by property grabbing, a practice whereby relatives of the deceased repossess all marital property, due to the high prevalence of HIV, which has led in turn to a large number of widows. Cultural beliefs regarding land tenure and growing tension over a shortage of arable land in rural poor communities has further fueled property grabbing from HIV-affected widows [3]. The economic viability of female-headed households is devastated by loss of homes and other property [1]. Both property grabbing and HIV affect each other—not only can HIV lead to property grabbing, but property grabbing can put a woman at risk of HIV infection as well. Widows who have lost their husbands to HIV face multiple challenges related to their property, health, and livelihoods. HIV-positive widows are often thrown out of their matrimonial homes and have their land taken by their late husband’s family, as they are blamed for their husband’s death and expected to die soon themselves. The widows have often exhausted their financial resources from coping with illness, and their health may also be deteriorating. They may also experience HIV-related stigma, which further increases their vulnerability. Potential impacts of disinheritance include diminished agricultural production and food security and engaging in unsafe sex for survival [4, 5]. In the context of HIV, ownership and control over economic assets can save women from destitution and shield them from unsafe sex and domestic violence [6].

National and international policies are essential for a legal environment that enables women to realize their property rights. Laws to protect WPIR exist in most countries, and governments are increasingly adopting new laws or amendments. In practice, however, many women still find that they cannot realize their legal rights. They may not be aware of their rights and the documentation needed to ensure them. They may lack access to legal services or the economic means to pursue legal options. Cultural norms may constrain women from seeking advice and support to realize their rights over land and other property. In countries like Uganda and Kenya, which have progressive land tenure laws in place to protect the rights of women to own land and property, reconciling entrenched social norms with national laws requires change at the community level, where the needs and benefits are most easily seen and addressed.

---

2 Broadly, property rights are how a person can use, control, and hold land, housing, livestock, material assets (for example, bicycles), or financial assets (for example, bank accounts). This compendium focuses on land, both because land has long been recognized as a primary source of wealth, social status and power, providing the basis for shelter, food and economic activities and because the majority of organizations working to address women’s property rights focus on land.
A growing body of qualitative and programmatic evidence suggests that community-based programs that integrate activities to support WPIR and HIV prevention, care and treatment are more effective at helping women and families mitigate the consequences of HIV than programs that address WPIR or HIV alone [7–9]. However, there is a dearth of quantitative evidence to support this assumption, largely due to the lack of routine measurement at the intersection of HIV and property rights. To better understand the effectiveness of combination programming at this intersection, more investment is needed in data collection and monitoring to document and evaluate the impact of programs that address both WPIR and HIV. A critical first step is having a clear understanding of current programmatic and M&E efforts.

To begin filling this gap, USAID supported the development of this compendium as part of a larger body of work on WPIR being implemented by MEASURE Evaluation. The compendium highlights programs working at the intersection of HIV and WPIR in Kenya and Uganda, countries that have been heavily affected by the HIV epidemic and subsequently are experiencing a high prevalence of property grabbing and disinheritance from widows and orphans. The compendium includes descriptions and analyses of the 11 organizations identified and two in-depth case studies. Though not meant to be exhaustive, the compendium represents the depth and breadth of current programming in Kenya and Uganda that includes both WPIR and HIV. We summarize current programmatic and M&E approaches, discuss the strengths and challenges of each, and provide recommendations for next steps.

The Local Context

In Kenya and Uganda, parallel systems of jurisdiction over property rights exist, as civil law may contradict traditional law and women may not be aware of their rights [10]. There are laws in place in both countries that should theoretically protect widows and orphans and defend their right to property following the death of their spouse or parent. The Ugandan Constitution provides for the rights of women to own and inherit property, and the Succession Act and Administrator General’s Act offer further legal protections for widows and orphans. Specifically, widows are the preferred administrators of their deceased husbands’ estates, and widows and orphans are intended to benefit from the estate in all cases, whether a will exists or not. However, customary law in Uganda is sometimes inconsistent with statutory law, and tends to prevail. Similarly, Kenya’s statutory laws prohibit discrimination against women and uphold gender equality and inheritance rights; but colonial, customary and religious laws, which are often discriminatory in nature, often override statutory laws [5].

By separating women from the land they work on, property grabbing hinders the productivity of the seized land, which in turn undermines economic development. Women in Kenya and Uganda provide a large percentage of the agricultural labor. In Uganda, women provide 70 to 80 percent of all agricultural labor and 90 percent of all labor involving food production nationwide [11]. Likewise, women in Kenya supply 70 percent of labor in the agricultural sector, but they hold only about one percent of registered land titles [12]. The influence of HIV on property grabbing has not currently been quantified in either country. Having standardized indicators that could be collected routinely by organizations working at the intersection of HIV and WPIR would generate needed evidence to inform appropriate responses at the national level.
Program Identification

In July and August 2011, ICRW staff conducted a web-based search to locate programs with ongoing activities in WPIR in East Africa, especially those working at the intersection of property rights and HIV. We focused our search on programs in two East African countries, Kenya and Uganda. Google was the primary search engine used, and key search terms were used in multiple combinations, including: Kenya, Uganda, HIV, AIDS, women, property rights, property ownership, inheritance rights, land rights, land tenure, land registration, disinheritance, property grabbing, legal aid, widows, orphans, paralegals, and legal education. Program identification also involved searching for references to programs in published reports, evaluations, and peer-reviewed and grey literature. Experts in WPIR and HIV in the USAID missions in Kenya and Uganda were also consulted for program recommendations. In order to be considered for inclusion in the compendium, programs had to operate in Kenya and/or Uganda, address both property rights and HIV and have some level of data collection and/or program evaluation.

A total of 43 programs were identified in Kenya and Uganda. USAID missions sent an initial introduction letter encouraging organizations to participate in the survey. ICRW subsequently contacted these organizations via email between August and October 2011 and requested them to complete a survey to provide the research team with more in-depth program information. The survey included space to describe program activities in property rights and HIV, program reach and impact, perceptions of implementation successes and challenges, monitoring and measurement of program success, and lessons learned. The survey also requested information about any data collected and recorded in association with WPIR and/or HIV programming, and how the data are organized, stored, and accessed.

Follow-up emails were sent, and reminder phone calls were made during this period to encourage organizations to complete the survey. Out of the 43 programs contacted, 11 completed the surveys, representing a 26 percent response rate. Upon receipt of the completed surveys, follow-up was conducted to clarify information and request further program documentation. We believe that organizations lacking a website or not responding to email or calls would be relatively small and less likely to have a data collection system addressing WPIR or HIV. However, we may have missed some organizations relevant to our study.

Scoring

A rigorous scoring process was undertaken to determine which programs to include in the compendium. Programs were scored on the following five categories:

1. Connections between property rights and HIV programming:
   - Level 1: Programming may have overlapping populations, but otherwise there is limited or no connection between property rights and HIV programming.
   - Level 2: Programming in HIV or property rights offers targeted/specific support to population affected by other.
   - Level 3: Program intentionally addresses both HIV and property rights issues, or needs specific to persons at risk in both areas.
2. Nature of data:
   - Level 1: None/Low rigor—Data exists but is not organized and compiled. Data is informally collected in the form of narrative reports, case reports, or program summaries with limited detail and design and no analysis.
   - Level 2: Moderately rigorous—Information is organized and collected with some design, which may be more descriptive than analytical. Quantitative data is lacking one of the elements required for level 3. May include unsystematic qualitative data.
   - Level 3: Highly rigorous—Computerized, organized, systematic, sex-disaggregated quantitative data and/or systematic qualitative data with clear analytical discussion.

3. Program outcomes (including gender-specific outcomes):
   - Level 1: The program is collecting or planning to collect outcomes.
   - Level 2: The program has demonstrated positive change in outcomes based on quantitative or qualitative data that has been collected.
   - Level 3: The program has conducted or is conducting analysis on outcomes.

4. Sustainability:
   - Level 1: Stakeholder involvement is demonstrated in program objectives, goals, or project descriptions.
   - Level 2: Stakeholder participation in program is evident (i.e., community or participants are involved in design, implementation, or feedback).
   - Level 3: Stakeholder ownership in program is evident (i.e., through contribution of community resources or clear financial support).

5. Feasibility for replication/scale-up:
   - Level 1: The program is planning to replicate or exploring possibilities to do so.
   - Level 2: Evidence indicates the program is suited for replication/scale-up, and lessons learned for replication/scale-up are available.
   - Level 3: The program or part of the program has been replicated and/or scaled up.

A team of six ICRW technical experts rated programs systematically and consistently according to the criteria listed above. Each of the 11 surveys was reviewed and rated by two ICRW staff members in order to ensure common understanding of the rating process, refine the criteria for evaluation, and ensure consistency. Each program was rated with a score of one (level 1) to three (level 3) for each of the five criteria. The maximum cumulative score for each program was 15 points. Discrepancies in ratings and all final scores were discussed as a group. The average score given was 10.0. A score of eight or higher was deemed sufficient to warrant inclusion in the compendium, and all 11 organizations met or surpassed this criterion.

**Compilation & Analysis**

A detailed description of each program was prepared based on information provided by organizations in the completed surveys and other program materials submitted for review. Program representatives had multiple opportunities to review and revise descriptions to ensure accuracy and clarity. Tables 1 and 2 (see Appendix) were prepared to better understand the commonalities in the programmatic and M&E approaches and activities undertaken by each of the organizations reviewed. Table 3 (see Appendix) highlights the current measures being assessed, either qualitatively or quantitatively, by each organization across three categories: demographics, WPIR, and HIV. While the table does not denote every variable collected, key areas of importance under each category were assessed.
Case Studies

To gather more in-depth information on some of the strategies being implemented to address HIV and property rights, two organizations, IJM and GROOTS, were selected for case studies. IJM and GROOTS received the highest scores during the rating process, had highly integrated models of HIV and WPIR services and used very different approaches to achieve similar results. Although it was only possible to conduct two case studies, the challenges, approaches taken, and lessons learned from these two organizations apply to other programs in the compendium as well.

Two ICRW staff visited each of the two case study programs in March 2012. These site visits were two days in length. Individual and group interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview guide with a variety of informants, including program implementers (e.g., project directors, lawyers, community mobilizers, and aftercare workers), program participants and beneficiaries (e.g., victims of property grabbing, home based care workers, and volunteers who help to prevent property grabbing in their communities, termed ‘watch dogs’). The team also gathered relevant materials, such as data collection and monitoring forms during the site visits. Field notes and program documents and materials also informed the case studies.

Limitations

This compendium is limited in scope to just two countries—Kenya and Uganda. The internet search in the program identification phase may have missed small or localized programs without a web presence. Furthermore, some programs’ limited resources or staff time may have impeded their capacity to respond to the survey. However, numerous attempts were made to contact the organizations identified to encourage completion of the survey. Finally, all information in the program profiles is self-reported by the programs; it is assumed that responses provided are accurate descriptions. In some instances, information about the programs has been verified where independent published sources made it possible to do so, but this was not possible for most of the programs.
Of the 43 programs identified and contacted in Kenya and Uganda, 11 completed the surveys, eight in Uganda and three in Kenya. Two of these organizations were founded principally to respond to the social and economic ramifications of the HIV epidemic for women, six were founded principally to address WPIR, and three were founded to address both HIV and WPIR. The organizations have been in existence for seven to 17 years. The most recent organization was formed in 2005, while the oldest organization was formed in 1995.

A number of important insights about programming and M&E at the intersection of HIV and WPIR emerged from this review. In this section, we first highlight common elements of programmatic responses to the overlapping needs of HIV affected widows and orphans seeking to overcome both health and land rights challenges. The origins of work at this intersection are discussed, followed by an in-depth examination of the types of activities being conducted, promising practices, and common challenges being faced. We then review current M&E efforts at the intersection of HIV and WPIR, including institutional M&E capacity, use and users of data generated, and current data collection efforts.

**Programmatic Reponses to HIV and WPIR**

**Convergence of Need**

Each of the organizations reviewed came to realize through their work the need to provide both HIV and WPIR services. For organizations initially involved in home-based HIV care, like GROOTS and UCOBAC, the frequency of property grabbing from women living with HIV and orphans became readily apparent. For example, GROOTS was initially formed to advance women’s development and rights, but shifted their programming in the midst of the HIV epidemic as women began to bear most of the burden in terms of caring for HIV affected family members. To address this need, GROOTS supported grassroots women’s organizations to train home-based caregivers, and it was these caregivers that then identified property grabbing as a prevalent and damaging issue. Based on this knowledge, ‘watch dog’ groups were formed in many areas to help identify and mitigate cases of property grabbing from HIV affected widows. Similarly, UCOBAC noticed that the property rights of many of their clients living with HIV were being challenged. The community paralegal program that was formed to respond to this need now works to educate communities about women’s constitutional land rights in Uganda and support HIV-affected widows to maintain ownership of their land.

Conversely, for organizations engaged mainly in protecting WPIR, it was observed that widows and orphans affected by HIV made up a large percentage of the client population. While initially seeking to foster functioning legal systems that protect the rights of vulnerable populations, IJM found that many clients seeking legal assistance for property grabbing in Uganda were widowed or orphaned due to HIV. Once this became apparent, programming was expanded to incorporate psychosocial support services for HIV-affected clients and families and a strong referral system for HIV-related services. While all of the organizations identified in this compendium worked on both WPIR and HIV, the degree of overlap varied widely and the actual integration of services was limited for most organizations, as depicted in Figure 1 on the following page.
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Figure 1: Examples of Organizations Working at the Intersection of Property Rights and HIV

High integration - Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood (GROOTS) Kenya, a network of women-led community groups, started off providing home-based HIV care, but now integrates community watchdog groups into their activities to protect the property rights of women living with HIV.

High integration – The International Justice Mission (IJM) is a human rights agency that aims to protect the rights of the poor globally. Although IJM initially focused on protecting WPIR through the legal system, they found that many clients seeking legal assistance were living with HIV and have expanded to incorporate a range of HIV-related services.

Medium integration – The Young Widows Advancement Program (YWAP) promotes the interests of widows and orphans by raising awareness of their sexual, property and inheritance rights. They provide paralegal services led by community volunteers and offer psychosocial support for family members affected by HIV/AIDS.

Low integration – The Uganda Land Alliance (ULA) is a consortium of organizations advocating for fair land laws that address the land rights of the poor and marginalized, including PLHIV.

Low integration – The Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU) links communities and government to make communities aware of their land rights and help policy makers understand the importance of protecting land rights. However, similar to ULA, HIV prevention and treatment are not integrated into their programming.
**Range of Activities and Approaches**

Overall, the organizations reviewed engaged more heavily in WPIR programming than in HIV programming. WPIR programming focused mainly on the identification and successful resolution of property grabbing cases, typically through a combination of legal education and awareness raising efforts about WPIR in the community, training on documentation needed to prevent property grabbing and mediation assistance, facilitated by either paralegals or lawyers. All organizations were engaged in legal aid, legal education and public advocacy/awareness raising. Six of the 11 organizations also conducted legal reform/policy work and titling and registration; only four provided financial support for housing or temporary shelter. The majority had engaged in some form of research related to WPIR (see Table 1 in Appendix).

Across the organizations reviewed, HIV programming focused mainly on providing emotional and psychosocial support and assisting individual clients to test and seek care and treatment. Organizations either provided these services directly or referred clients to existing HIV service organizations. All 11 organizations were engaged in activities or approaches to mitigate the negative consequences of HIV. Some organizations specifically targeted women living with HIV to reduce or minimize the negative effects of property grabbing (e.g., KELIN, LEMU, and ULA). Others provided referrals to HIV service organizations (e.g., UGANET) and a few provided mitigation services directly (e.g., GROOTS, IJM and UCOBAC). Two organizations were directly involved in prevention activities; four provided care and three provided treatment or adherence support. These services were provided either through home-based caregivers or through linkages with HIV service organizations. Psychosocial support was also offered by four organizations. None of the organizations had engaged in research activities specifically related to HIV (see Table 1 in Appendix).

Some organizations, such as GROOTS, SWID and UCOBAC, became directly involved in providing care to women living with HIV, while others established or strengthened referral systems to link women, children, and affected families into existing HIV treatment, care and support services (e.g., UGANET). Yet another approach, taken by IJM, was the provision of case managers for clients whose property grabbing cases were in progress. Case managers visited clients on a monthly basis, provided psychosocial support directly, assessed health and economic needs, and accompanied clients to referral services, such as health facilities, for a range of HIV-related services (e.g., HIV testing, antiretroviral drug collection, PMTCT services, etc.) and economic empowerment organizations, like Beads for Life, to support additional livelihood options.

**Gender Strategies**

Programming for WPIR and HIV cut across a number of the gender strategies currently prioritized by donors such as PEPFAR. All of the organizations reviewed were engaged in raising awareness of women’s rights and in legal protection/access to justice for women’s rights. Most programs also addressed customary norms and practices, fostered women’s access to income and productive resources, and worked to ensure women’s participation in communities and public life. Only four of the 11 organizations had any programming targeted towards reducing gender-based violence. Male norms and practices were being addressed by two organizations (see Table 1 in Appendix).

**Current Integration Approaches**

Community-driven approaches and direct involvement of key change agents in communities were commonly employed to prevent property grabbing, mitigate the effects of HIV, and ensure implementation of national laws protecting WPIR. A common way in which organizations mobilized grassroots responses was through teaching transferable skills to a small number...
of volunteers who subsequently shared this knowledge with others in their community. This approach appeared to enhance the sustainability of efforts to reduce property grabbing and support the care of women living with HIV and their families.

Both SWID and GROOTS train community members to engage in community mapping. Mapping the risks and vulnerabilities in a community enables community members to design and implement programs, together with national or international organizations, that are responsive to the needs identified. SWID and GROOTS use mapping to help gather information from residents of communities in which they wish to set up activities. Empowering communities to lead the mapping process builds ownership in the process and ensures that community members, opinion leaders, and duty bearers have a thorough understanding of the barriers to addressing women’s property rights and/or HIV.

Another transferable skill provided by many of the organizations reviewed was paralegal training of community members. For example, GWED-G trained a small number of community members to serve as human rights volunteers. These volunteers provide many of the same types of services that paralegals provide. They also created Rapid Action Teams, which function to help identify cases of property grabbing requiring assistance from GWED-G. The team also assists human rights volunteers in mediation matters, specifically around investigation and follow-up. Similarly, GROOTS supported the creation of watch dog groups to reduce property grabbing from HIV affected widows. Through an intensive, eight-week program, GROOTS trains one member from each group as a paralegal. This person is then responsible for training the other members of their watch dog group. UGANET also trains volunteer paralegals in human rights issues, but ensures that they have a direct connection with lawyers who can lead the most difficult cases.

Engaging key stakeholders and opinion leaders is another critical approach for shifting the norms and structures that perpetuate property grabbing from HIV affected widows. In many cases, reducing property grabbing from HIV affected widows will require a shift in the cultural norms and practices that often impede mediation processes or the application of constitutional laws. The support of key stakeholders, such as local community, government, and religious leaders is essential for changing attitudes about land tenure for women and removing barriers within existing structures, such as the police and the court system, that impede due process of national law.

Both KELIN and IJM have employed this model. KELIN has trained elders in the cultural structures on women’s property rights in order to be more attuned to the needs or problems raised by their clients. KELIN has designed a toolkit for engaging with the cultural structures and systems and is expanding trainings on women’s property rights under the new 2010 Constitution of Kenya to include orphans and the children of widows who have faced property rights violations. IJM is also expanding efforts to train and involve key stakeholders to protect WPIR. For example, they are training religious leaders on the necessary documentation needed to safeguard WPIR, such as wills, marriage certificates and birth certificates. In this way, religious leaders will be better able to encourage their parishioners to obtain key documentation. Children can also serve as important change agents in their communities. KELIN is currently training orphans to raise awareness about and advance the cause of human rights and in particular WPIR and the rights of people living with and affected by HIV.

---

3 In Uganda, the term ‘paralegal’ can only be used by individuals who have undergone a specific type of training over a specified amount of time. While GWED-G’s volunteers have undergone training in human rights and legal issues and conduct a number of the same activities as paralegals, they have not completed the official training required to be deemed ‘paralegals’. Thus GWED-G refers to them as ‘human rights volunteers’ instead.
Programmatic Challenges

Program reach
The scale and intensity of programming at the intersection of HIV and WPIR varied widely. For example, UGANET conducts activities in five districts in Uganda and thus reaches a large number of people with community awareness efforts, legal education, and other WPIR activities. However, to cover such a broad geographic area, UGANET relies heavily on volunteers, which poses challenges in terms of frequency of activities and sustainability in the longer term. In contrast, IJM, which focuses in only one district in Uganda, has paid staff members who provide community education sessions monthly, immediate assistance to clients, regular case management, and rigorous data collection.

There are inherent challenges and benefits to both approaches. Programs with a limited geographic reach can provide more intensified services and can reach the majority of property grabbing victims in a given area. They can also gain a deeper understanding of the key barriers to WPIR and more directly address them. However, the lessons learned from the process may be restricted to those areas, if customary laws and customs differ widely across the country. Conversely, programs like GROOTS, with 2,500 grassroots groups across the country and 45 active watch dog groups, have the potential to influence WPIR more broadly throughout the country. Such programs often rely on committed community volunteers, however, and limited resources impede both the regular provision of technical assistance and collection of program monitoring data. Thus there is greater variability in the quality, coverage, and sustainability of services.

Difficulty shifting cultural norms and practices
Five of the 11 organizations reviewed (i.e., LEMU, ULA, UGANET, GROOTS and YWAP) cited that the shifting of cultural norms and practices, which are often discriminatory towards women and contradict national laws, is a major programmatic challenge. The majority of organizations had activities specifically targeted toward shifting cultural norms and practices. Typical strategies employed included: training for key stakeholders and duty bearers, mobilizing community volunteers to encourage accountability, legal education, and awareness raising activities. However, as exemplified by routine program monitoring data collected by IJM, the success of these approaches is often hampered by rapid transferring of sensitized community leaders (e.g., police in Uganda), regular turnover among the local community leadership, and conflicting interests among community stakeholders (e.g., regional and local council persons).

Structural barriers
Another area, which organizations found particularly challenging, was ensuring that clients were able to obtain the legal documentation needed to prove their land ownership rights after cases were successfully mediated. IJM, for example, has found that it can take up to two years and an average of 40 trips to the Administrator General’s office in Kampala for a widow to be granted official documentation of land ownership. This process is both time intensive and costly and keeps women at risk of experiencing property grabbing again. Likewise, IJM has also found that high absenteeism of judges lengthens the time it takes to achieve successful resolution of property grabbing cases for the small percentage of cases that end up in the court system. These barriers and inefficiencies within current legal structures limit the ability of organizations working on WPIR to achieve successful resolution of cases and leave women vulnerable to both economic and health risks.
Monitoring and Evaluation

All of the organizations reviewed expressed a desire to enhance program M&E of their WPIR and HIV activities. There was a recognized need for high quality data to inform both programming and advocacy efforts. Ten out of 11 were currently collecting some routine process monitoring statistics, but most lacked routine and rigorous data collection and evaluation, often because implementers did not have sufficient resources or technical capacity. For those organizations able to monitor their activities, the data for HIV and WPIR activities were captured and stored separately for the majority and only a few organizations stored data electronically. There was only one example of a database that could produce basic reports combing the HIV and WPIR monitoring data. Importantly, none of the measures collected directly assessed the link between WPIR and HIV.

Institutional M&E Capacity

The institutional M&E capacity of the majority of the organizations reviewed was limited. For example, only three organizations had M&E officers on staff. While the majority used standardized forms or questionnaires to collect data, only two computerized all data and six computerized some data. The remainder of the organizations kept only paper copies (see Table 2 in Appendix).

Institutional Use of Data

Among the organizations collecting data, very few actually used the data for program improvement or evaluation purposes. The most common uses were reporting to donors (all 11 organizations) and advocacy (six organizations). Five organizations stated that they shared some of their data with stakeholders, such as government authorities, NGOs and partners. Yet only a few organizations used data to inform program design and activities (see Table 2 in Appendix).

Rigorous data analyses were fairly uncommon among the programs reviewed, namely due to the fact that the data collected are often not stored systematically or electronically. This greatly limits the ability to learn from the data collected for both program improvement and advocacy purposes. Effectively collecting, organizing, and storing data requires resources that many of the organizations reviewed do not have. For example, UCOBAC collects rich data that have the potential to demonstrate the intersection between WPIR and HIV through its home-based care volunteers. The volunteers use two different forms to document the information that they collect from beneficiaries, but the data are not computerized and thus the opportunity to conduct deeper analysis is missed. Alternatively, IJM has begun to advocate for changes in the Ugandan legal system based on problems identified through routine monitoring of programming activities that are tracked in an electronic database. They have also been able to identify areas in which more intensive activities are required through both a baseline survey and review of routine program monitoring data.

Data Collection

Many of the programs reviewed in this compendium collected program level data related to WPIR but not HIV. Qualitative data, typically gathered via informal conversations/feedback and semi-structured interviews, were more commonly collected than quantitative data. A few organizations also conducted focus group discussions and three conducted community-mapping exercises. Quantitative data were collected through pre/post training surveys and through routine monitoring forms completed by either home-based caregivers, community WPIR volunteers, or in the case of IJM, program staff. Only one organization (AHURO) had conducted case studies and only IJM had engaged in survey research with and without sampling on a larger scale (See Table 2 in Appendix).
All organizations collected information on the age and gender of clients, eight organizations captured marital status, five captured employment status, and three collected data on income. Across the organizations, there were 14 topics within WPIR for which more than one organization collected some data, either qualitative or quantitative. All of them collected information about the nature of the land and/or property dispute, such as who was involved and the number of victims, and the majority monitored the status of cases. This information was typically captured in narratives and was not computerized. Just over half of the organizations tracked whether cases were using the formal or informal justice system and a few monitored the success of programmatic activities, such as legal aid and community outreach activities. Only four organizations collected information on whether documentation of land ownership was obtained and whether the client and/or their family member has/had a will. The level of engagement of duty bearers was only monitored quantitatively by one organization (see Table 3 in Appendix).

The range of data collected relevant to HIV programming was much more limited and the majority of this information was qualitative in nature and was not computerized. Three organizations captured information on the general health and wellbeing of clients, whether they participated in support groups, and whether they were receiving treatment for HIV. Two collected information on whether clients were receiving services from volunteer caregivers and assessed challenges to accessing health services. Eight organizations asked clients if they had experienced violence, but only four captured this information quantitatively (see Table 3 in Appendix).

**M&E Challenges**

To advance an understanding of the relationship between HIV and land ownership, there needs to be data on the women affected by either. To know whether land loss makes a woman more vulnerable to HIV infection, one would ideally know whether HIV risk behaviors become more common following the loss of land. And to know whether HIV infection makes a woman more likely to lose her land, one would need to know whether attempts to displace her were more frequent or more forcible following knowledge of her infection. However, there are a number of significant impediments to the collection of data on both land security and HIV risk. They include the following:

**Categorical thinking**

Lawyers who address land rights are unaccustomed to thinking about HIV risk behaviors. And health professionals who address HIV risk behaviors are unaccustomed to thinking about land rights. Professionals from the two disciplines are trained to focus on particular matters that don’t reach into the other discipline. Moreover, there are no professional incentives to think or behave any differently. This may be the greatest barrier of all—one of professional cultures.

**Lack of financial support**

Most organizations found it difficult to secure funding to integrate HIV and WPIR activities, stating that donors tended to fund one area or the other, but typically not both. The categorical or siloed funding of programs to address these two interlinked areas subsequently encouraged separate data collection and M&E efforts, where such efforts were possible. Another challenge expressed was the difficulty in raising funds to appropriately monitor and evaluate programming at the intersection of HIV and WPIR. Due to financial constraints, several organizations only collected M&E data if the funding institution specifically required it, and only three had an M&E officer on staff.
**Logistical difficulties**
The ability to collect and link information about WPIR and HIV activities and outcomes for individual clients was particularly problematic for organizations that relied on referrals for HIV services. Collecting integrated data would require either a case manager who could track outcomes for both areas, or strong linkages and integrated M&E systems among the organizations supporting the various aspects of WPIR and client’s health and wellbeing.

**Lack of standardized indicators**
There is a general lack of standardization in the types of measures collected to monitor programs working at the intersection of HIV and WPIR. There is also a wide variety of information being gathered related to WPIR and a general lack of information being collected about HIV programming. The paucity of comparable data greatly limits the utility of the data currently being collected for both program improvement and advocacy purposes. This gap suggests that little guidance exists on what to measure at the intersection of HIV and WPIR and how to measure it.
The findings from the organizations studied point to a number of programmatic practices that seem promising, and others that present challenges. We also note M&E practices that are needed.

**Programmatic Practices**

Community participation appears to improve the chances of women holding onto their land. Community involvement in efforts to improve WPIR can build networks, increase leadership capacity, and increase women’s roles in local government.

The legal system is challenged by inadequately executed processes and by cultural norms at odds with the law. Communities need to address both of these issues by advocating for legal systems that function as prescribed. This means judges that show up in court regularly and who uphold the law rather than bending to local customs. A single organization addressing WPIR can advocate for both or partner with another organization to cover both needs.

The high reliance of many WPIR and HIV programs on volunteers is both a boon and a threat to sustainability. Mobilizing the grassroots to guard against property grabbing, particularly among HIV affected women and families, greatly enhances the reach of WPIR and HIV services and increases accountability of key stakeholders and duty bearers to follow national rather than the customary laws. However, the lack of resources to compensate volunteers for their time and effort greatly limits the extent of their engagement and makes monitoring programmatic efforts extremely difficult. We do not have an easy answer for this challenge. We can only recommend that organizations with volunteers work to find ways to make the work rewarding in terms of “wins” achieved for women at risk of losing land or becoming infected.

We also recommend that programs working at the intersection of WPIR and HIV routinely document the roadblocks in both the formal and informal justice systems. This can inform the development of programmatic and advocacy strategies to remove the identified barriers and inefficiencies.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Programs working on WPIR and HIV should seek to capture data on gender-based and sexual violence experienced by clients during and several months after the successful resolution of property grabbing cases. A few programs noted that anecdotal evidence suggests that violence is increasing as a result of the success of programs to keep women and orphans on their land. Currently, most organizations stop collecting data as soon as a case is resolved. Further investigation through formal qualitative research is also warranted.

Where possible, organizations should hire M&E officers to develop M&E plans, prioritize evaluable questions, identify key uses and users of data and ensure that data are collected routinely using the most appropriate methods and tools. M&E officers can also ensure that data are stored systematically in electronic databases and can perform statistical analyses to better understand program processes as well as outcomes and impacts.
The majority of reporting conducted by the programs reviewed was donor driven; few organizations reported being engaged in systematic monitoring and evaluation and instead, reported only what was required. The main barrier to program monitoring and evaluation noted by organizations reviewed was a lack of resources. To this end, it is critical that resources be made available to ensure that programs working at the intersection of WPIR and HIV can document programmatic lessons and successes; only then will they be able to enhance activities to prevent property grabbing from women living with HIV and share their experiences more broadly with the global community.
Introduction

The case studies presented here provide examples of two distinct approaches to addressing the intersection of HIV and property rights. Both organizations featured in the case studies came to recognize the problem from their work with communities. One organization, Grassroots Organizations Operating in Sisterhood (GROOTS), employs a ground-up strategy that builds the capacity of local women and men to identify and respond to issues in their communities, including HIV care and property grabbing. In the other, International Justice Mission (IJM), trained professionals provide legal and social support services to clients they identify through monthly legal education sessions.

Both organizations are attempting to change the structures, such as the police response to property grabbing cases, the mediation and land demarcation process, and the court system. These structures often work against vulnerable women and children. One organization in our case studies addresses negative structures by creating a grassroots movement and the other through utilizing program data to advocate for the removal of roadblocks to justice. For example, by decreasing absenteeism of judges and government officials and decreasing corruption in the police and land boards, the time it takes for women to achieve justice and retain their land will be greatly reduced and resources currently being wasted throughout the lengthy process could be used to support care and treatment costs for women and children living with HIV.

Both organizations have made inroads into shifting the public justice system and have seen their work result in favorable judgments for women who have brought their cases to court or to local government officials for mitigation to protect their land and inheritance rights. The following case studies summarize the intervention and monitoring and evaluation strategies of each program, discuss the challenges of each approach, and provide recommendations for enhancement that will be useful to program implementers, policymakers and funders interested in strategies to ameliorate property grabbing from HIV-affected women and children in East Africa.

Empowering Grassroots Groups to Address HIV and Property Rights: The Case of GROOTS Kenya

After her husband died from AIDS-related causes in 2000, Mary came home one day to find her house demolished. This act was the culmination of a six-year struggle Mary had with her in-laws, who wanted her land for themselves. She had heard about a women’s ‘watch dog’ group that helped widows in similar circumstances and went to meet the group the next day. After hearing her story, the watch dog group members marched several kilometers with Mary to the District Commissioner’s office. By the time they reached the office, their numbers had swelled as others learned about Mary’s predicament and wanted to support her. Together, the group and the District Commissioner convinced the land board to stop the demarcation of her land and Mary was able to retain ownership. Members then raised funds from the community so Mary could construct a new home.

Mary’s story is not unique. Property grabbing from HIV-affected widows and orphans is a serious issue in Kenya. Widows whose husbands have died from AIDS are often thrown out of
their homes, so relatives can illegally attempt to claim (or reclaim) land and property. A grassroots network of community groups is working to build a collective, localized response to the problem. The watch dog group that helped Mary is part of this nationwide movement spearheaded by Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood (GROOTS) Kenya.

GROOTS\(^4\) Kenya builds the power of grassroots groups to respond to key issues in their communities, such as protecting HIV-affected women’s property and inheritance rights.\(^5\) Established in 1995, GROOTS is a network of women-led community groups that links leaders and other groups in poor areas throughout rural and urban Kenya in order to promote solidarity and support among women engaged in improving their communities. It was formed to understand women’s needs and priorities in social and economic development, and increase women’s involvement in decision-making that directly impacts them and their communities. The GROOTS movement is made up of 2,500 grassroots groups across eight areas\(^6\) in seven provinces. These grassroots groups carry all of the activities on the ground out with some technical and limited financial support\(^7\) from the GROOTS secretariat, a staff of 14 Kenyan women in Nairobi.

**Program Implementation and Monitoring**

As the HIV epidemic grew in the late 1990s, GROOTS noticed women’s attendance in grassroots meetings was declining due to either AIDS-related illnesses or caregiving responsibilities. GROOTS staff and women’s groups responded by developing programs for HIV mitigation through its home-based caregivers initiative. When these caregivers identified property grabbing from HIV-affected widows and orphans as a widespread problem, GROOTS expanded its program mandate and created its watch dog groups to protect women’s property rights.

**Home-based caregivers**

Home-based caregivers serve as a link between clients living with HIV and health care facilities in their communities. Since 2003, GROOTS has trained and mobilized 1,507 male and 8,543 female volunteers from their existing grassroots groups to become home-based caregivers in their communities. Caregivers monitor client’s health, nutrition, and treatment by relatives; they also provide psychosocial support to widows after losing loved ones and help them deal with experiences of stigma and discrimination, including property grabbing. Pregnant clients are encouraged to seek antenatal care and, when appropriate, caregivers refer widows and orphans to other HIV service organizations for care, treatment, and social support, including comprehensive care centers (CCC) for HIV.\(^8\) In addition, caregivers respond to clients’ needs on a practical level by introducing women to income-generating activities and providing school fees for orphans.\(^9\) Each caregiver has approximately 20 households that they visit on a monthly basis. At the initial visit, caregivers complete a standardized checklist to collect information about the client’s home environment, such as the number of members in the household (including children and their ages), social support from family members and neigh-
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1. GROOTS Kenya is affiliated with GROOTS International and the Huairou Commission. GROOTS International operates in 34 countries worldwide. Throughout this case study when “GROOTS” is mentioned, “GROOTS Kenya” is implied.
2. Approximately 40% of GROOTS Kenya’s efforts and resources in 2010 and 2011 were dedicated to property rights as opposed to the other issues GROOTS Kenya is involved in.
3. The areas, which GROOTS calls “focal areas,” are generally about the size of a district, but could cover an area larger or smaller than a district. The focal areas coordinate with the GROOTS Secretariat.
4. The women in the grassroots groups (including the home-based caregivers and watch dogs) are volunteers, however GROOTS Kenya factors in some funds to support transport and meals for the groups’ meetings in most of their grants.
5. Comprehensive care centers are funded by PEPFAR and offer a “complete” package of care for HIV infected people, which includes clinical, psychosocial, social, legal, and nursing care.
6. Communities raise the school fees through fundraising initiatives. In addition, GROOTS seeks external support from donors to support the orphans with school fees.
bors, and the availability of pit latrines, mosquito nets, potable water, and kitchen gardens. The checklist also captures the client’s health issues, including if the client is on ARVs and their adherence and nutrition status. Caregivers check whether the children in the household have been immunized and administer vitamin A supplements as needed. In cases where property rights have been violated, caregivers develop the client’s case history by recording the reasons for property grabbing and information on what facilitated the disinheritance (e.g., culture, religion, ignorance of the laws, etc.).

Completed checklists are kept on file at the local GROOTS offices; most of the data are not computerized. The GROOTS Secretariat also maintains a shared Google spreadsheet to capture data on the home-based caregivers themselves, such as their region, location, and the households they take care of, which can be updated by groups with access to the internet. The home-based caregivers communicate regularly with CCC data clerks about their clients’ care to maximize adherence to ARVs, but do not have access to the data files. The CCCs have a standardized, electronic tracking system in which they record demographic, health status and medication information for each client.

**Watch dog groups**

Watch dog groups aim to protect widows and orphans against disinheritance by identifying potential violations and mediating land disputes. Since 2004, 51 watch dog groups have been formed within existing grassroots groups. Each group has approximately 15 to 25 members comprised of key stakeholders and community members, including widows and orphans who have been assisted by the groups. The majority of members and group leaders are women, but in some communities men participate.

When a community decides to form a watch dog group, one member is selected to attend an intensive paralegal training course provided by GROOTS staff in Nairobi. This course consists of eight, two-week sessions conducted over an eight-month period, and though it mostly focuses on women’s property rights, it also includes components on human rights for people living with HIV (PLHIV). The trained paralegals then train the other members of their watch dog group, ensuring that all members have basic legal knowledge of property rights and can work in parallel with the formal justice system. Watch dog group members advise widows and orphans and carry out mediations to resolve conflicts before disinheritance occurs or before people go to court. They also raise awareness of property rights in the community and inform vulnerable women of the proper procedures to secure official documents, such as wills and marriage or birth certificates, to avoid property grabbing.

Watch dog group members meet monthly, and also connect with other groups in nearby villages on a quarterly basis to discuss challenges and successes. The groups also hold community dialogues and participate in public **barazas**, or community meetings led by the local chief approximately three times a month to discuss Kenyan policies and community issues. As a result of these activities to raise awareness, community leaders or members often refer women and orphans directly to GROOTS grassroots groups.

Data collection is not currently systematic, but each watch dog group is trained in record keeping and encouraged to maintain a client register and a follow-up register to track the number of cases handled each year and the status of each case. In this way, GROOTS can estimate the number of successful outcomes per group on an annual basis. The follow-up register typically
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10 GROOTS defines a successful outcome as when a woman gains legal ownership of potentially disinheritied land, and is able to coexist with her aggressors peacefully.
tracks the nature of a client’s case, a statement about the plaintiff and defendant, a court and/or police file number, other stakeholders involved and the intervention strategy. Paper copies of relevant documents on each case are also kept to show how the case has been handled.

The monitoring data are intended to be reported to GROOTS on a monthly basis; however, the frequency of reporting varies based on the capacity and time availability of the volunteer watch dog group members. In areas where groups have access to a computer and electricity, the property rights monitoring data is transferred into a Word document and saved electronically. To strengthen the capacity of the watch dog groups to collect and enter monitoring data, GROOTS has begun training a few women per watch dog group in computer skills, documentation, information management, and data entry. Funds from one or more of their donors have allowed GROOTS to 10 of the 51 groups.

Results

The GROOTS model of empowering the community members to identify and respond to key issues and concerns in their own communities has been very successful at enabling communities across Kenya to respond to the HIV epidemic and the ensuing increase in property grabbing from women and orphans affected by HIV. There are currently 10,050 home-based caregivers trained using the GROOTS home-based care curriculum and an estimated 765 watch dog members throughout the seven focal regions in Kenya. The integration of home-based care and watch dog services in 51 communities has resulted in faster identification of potential property grabbing cases, which in turn enabled preventive mediation in many cases or more timely mediation after property grabbing occurred.

Due to the encouragement of home-based caregivers and watch dog groups, more mothers who give birth at home have been registering the births at the chiefs’ offices to safeguard future inheritance rights for their children and themselves. In Kiamworia, for example, caregivers found that some pregnant women were not going to the clinic for antenatal care or to give birth because they were afraid of testing positive for HIV and the resulting stigma. If a woman gives birth at home and the child’s birth is not registered, this can be problematic in terms of children’s and their mothers’ future inheritance rights. Watch dog group members also encourage the registrar to visit the community a few times a year to have births registered.

The number of property grabbing cases identified annually in Kiamworia decreased from 47 to five since the watch dog group was initiated in 2005. Although this reduction cannot be directly linked to the presence of watch dog groups, both the monitoring data and anecdotal reports from the group members provides some support for this conclusion. Property grabbing in many communities has decreased due to actions such as these described by Bemina, a Kiamworia watch dog group client and member.

In 2007 my husband died, and my in-laws tried to evict me. In the eulogy my in-laws weren’t going to recognize me as the wife of the deceased. One of the watch dog members from Kiamworia intervened very aggressively. They talked to the priest, and wrote a formal letter explaining the rightful beneficiaries. The priest agreed that there would be no eulogy at the burial, as I had not been mentioned as the wife. The watch dogs provided me moral support, and followed up to ensure I was never forced out of my home. Now I myself am a watch dog and a peer educator, and am always spreading the word in my community that HIV is not a reason to have property taken away from you.

Relevant documents could include wills, birth certificates, death certificates, eulogies, marriage certificates, land title documents, official correspondence, and probate forms.
One of the most striking outcomes of GROOTS’ work with women has been the rise in women’s leadership. Women who served as home-based caregivers and watch dog members are seen as well-informed and articulate about key issues affecting their communities. A number of women active in the grassroots groups have been selected to serve as a village chief or assistant chief. One woman in the Kiamworia group became assistant chief in the provincial administration. In Gatundu, eight of the 42 assistant chiefs are women, all of whom were involved in either home-based caregiving or watch dog activities. In several communities, women who were previously home-based care workers or watch dogs serve on district land boards, which are responsible for demarcating land after the death of a landowner, and as ombudspersons, who lead mediations about land disputes in the community. More women on key decision-making bodies in the community helps protect women’s land and inheritance rights, as explained by a female watch dog group member, who sits on the land board in Kiamworia:

The land board demarcates the land after a landowner dies. When families come to us now, we won’t demarcate the land unless the widow has some. We will ask, ‘Where is she going to cultivate? Where is she going to be buried?’ In this way, we help to ensure that widows are not disinherited and have enough land to sustain their families.

Empowering grassroots women to participate in local government and influence policymaking is critical in order to institutionalize the protection of women’s and orphan’s property and inheritance rights in Kenya.

Challenges and Recommendations

Culture

Cultural beliefs about land and tenure vary widely across the country, which creates challenges for GROOTS groups as they attempt to integrate HIV care services with property rights. Home-based caregivers and watch dog groups must continuously assess the needs of their target populations and adapt their programmatic approaches accordingly to provide care and protect the property rights of women and children in their communities. For example, among the Luo in Western Kenya where HIV prevalence rates are high, many communities are open to hearing about HIV services. However, patriarchal beliefs do not allow women to own land, and watch dog groups have difficulty advocating for a woman’s legal right to property, as stated in Kenya’s constitution.

Among the Kikuyu in Central Kenya, land is scarce. HIV provides an easy excuse for relatives to grab land from widows. For this reason, HIV-positive women often are unwilling to get tested, disclose their status and seek available HIV-related services. The advent of antiretroviral therapy (ART) and provider-initiated testing has complicated matters. Mothers may avoid routine health care, such as childhood immunizations and clinic-based births, in an attempt to avoid HIV testing. Also, non-disclosure by HIV-positive women can lead to problems with ART adherence.

In many regions of Kenya, there are deeply rooted tensions over the accessibility of arable land. Consequently, the success of GROOTS programs in protecting WPIR may be leading to some negative consequences. Some watch dog groups have reported more cases of gender-based violence and child sexual abuse among their clients, which may suggest a backlash against women.
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12 Provincial administration officers represent the Kenyan government at the community level, and include assistant chiefs, chiefs, district officers and district commissioner who report to the Ministry of Internal Security. There is one chief for approximately every 300 households, and one assistant chief for every 100 households. District officers are in charge of four to six chiefs, and the district commissioner is in charge of about seven districts.

13 Each district in Kenya has its own land board, and members are appointed from each village within the district.
and children who have retained their land. In response, GROOTS is encouraging all of the grassroots groups to pay close attention to this issue, raise it with local leaders, and in community meetings, and monitor the number of cases of violence and abuse reported. In some instances, men who have joined watch dog groups are now on the forefront of fighting against gender based violence towards widows. It would also be beneficial to explore the relationship between client’s retention of land and potential negative consequences explicitly through qualitative research.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Collecting M&E data for program activities throughout the GROOTS network also has its challenges. Although GROOTS’ main priority is supporting the programmatic efforts of the grassroots women’s groups, the lack of routine M&E data is hampering its ability to improve and expand these efforts.

The extensive GROOTS network throughout Kenya and the nature of the “ground up” grassroots movement has made it difficult to institute systematic program monitoring. For grassroots volunteers, collecting monitoring data is problematic due to both human capacity and time constraints. GROOTS staff felt that it may not be feasible to task volunteers with the responsibility without monetary compensation. Thus GROOTS only conducts systematic M&E of specific programs if required by donors. The ability to develop and implement a M&E system for the entire GROOTS network is also hampered by the lack of a M&E specialist on staff at the Secretariat. Contingent on securing funding, GROOTS plans to hire a dedicated M&E specialist to address this gap.

Another challenge for aggregating data across the GROOTS network has been the lack of consistency in the M&E tools that have been developed and used to date. For example, group members must conduct a mapping exercise to identify the key issues related to HIV and women’s property rights in their communities prior to starting a watch dog group. A mapping tool, which consists of a mix of open and close-ended questions, is provided for this purpose, but grassroots members typically adapt the interview guide, making it difficult to compare results across contexts. In addition, key demographic information, such as the age, gender, and marital status of the respondents, is not included, making data analysis less robust. The tool, which has been field-tested in many communities, could be standardized with questions asked in a quantitative format, supplemented by a few open-ended questions.

Currently, data collected from clients on their health status is kept separate from their disinheritance cases and not collated into a single client database. In addition, once a property grabbing case is closed, there is no standardized way to record issues that may arise as a result of the client retaining their land.

GROOTS would benefit greatly from a central client database in which a few key indicators could be collected from each client and updated on a routine basis. This would ideally be a combination of a web-based platform, where groups with access to computers could enter their data directly, and a paper-based system, where forms would be sent to GROOTS’ Secretariat to be entered into the database. GROOTS has begun this process by training a few women in each group on documentation, information sharing, and management. It would need to secure additional funding to develop and implement the client database.

A solid M&E system and framework that addresses these challenges could improve the effectiveness of GROOTS interventions; provide donors with solid evidence of accomplishments; and secure future funding to sustain, improve, and scale-up their HIV and property rights
programming. Data could also be used to advocate for structural level changes at the national and local levels that could be implemented to reduce the prevalence of property grabbing from widows and orphans nationwide.

**Accessing Justice for HIV-Affected Widows: International Justice Mission’s Legal and Social Assistance Program in Mukono**

After the death of her husband from HIV, Constance was left to support her four children and purchase her antiretroviral medication (ARV) with what she could earn from selling the crops she tended on her land. Then her late husband’s family violently threatened to kick her off the small patch of land and sell it for her own financial gain. Unlike many widows in similar circumstances, Constance was actually able to retain her land, improve her financial stability and continue taking ARVs through legal and social support received from International Justice Mission (IJM).

IJM is a human rights agency that aims to protect the rights of the poor globally by partnering with local governments to transform the structures, particularly within the legal system, that leave the poor vulnerable to violence and oppression. IJM lawyers, investigators, and aftercare professionals work alongside local officials to secure immediate victim rescue and aftercare, to prosecute perpetrators, and to ensure that public justice systems—police, courts and laws—effectively protect the poor.

IJM’s fifteen offices around the world combat pressing forms of injustice—like slavery, property grabbing, sexual exploitation, and police abuse—that affect poor, marginalized populations. IJM Kampala opened in 2002 and began working on behalf of victims of a variety of injustices. After six years, IJM observed that violations to women’s property and inheritance rights were a common problem, particularly among HIV-affected widows. It focused its efforts in Mukono, a district adjacent to Kampala in central Uganda heavily affected by HIV and property grabbing. Approximately 30 percent of widows and orphans in Mukono experience property grabbing following the death of their spouse or parent, and 26 percent of victims are forcibly evicted from their homes and left destitute.¹⁴

The Ugandan Constitution protects widows’ and orphans’ rights to inherit property. The Ugandan Succession Act and Administrator General’s Act offer further legal protections for widows and orphans. However, customs and practices in communities, or customary laws, can be inconsistent with the Constitution and other statutory laws.

*There is a persistent cultural belief in Uganda that women shouldn’t inherit property.*
—Gerry, lawyer, IJM

**Program Implementation**

HIV and WPIR are interlinked in Mukono. The majority of IJM’s clients are widows, who are disproportionately affected by HIV in Uganda.¹⁵ Among IJM’s widowed clients who have
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¹⁴ Ampaire, C and Ngabirano, P. IJM Uganda Baseline Study Report on Succession—Related Property Grabbing in Mukono County, Uganda, July 2008. This was a cross sectional descriptive study that IJM conducted in 2007 which surveyed 105 members of the general public, 115 widows, and 109 orphans in the district of Mukono

¹⁵ According to the Demographic Health Sero-behavioral Survey for Uganda from 2004-2005, women and men who are widowed are the most likely to be HIV infected. Almost one-third of women (31.2 percent) and men (32.2 percent) who have been widowed are HIV positive, compared with around 6 percent of those who are currently married.
tested for HIV, one third are positive,\textsuperscript{16} which is considerably higher than the national adult prevalence of 6.5 percent.\textsuperscript{17} HIV-affected widows have often exhausted their financial resources from coping with their own illness and/or family members’ illness, and their health may also be deteriorating. Widows also experience HIV-related stigma, which further increases their vulnerability. IJM staff members often find that relatives use HIV as a justification for taking property from the widow.

\textit{Families often use HIV as an excuse for property grabbing. In-laws may assert that the widow won’t be around for long because she has HIV. Or they say the widow killed her husband by giving him HIV.} —Sam, investigator, IJM

Given the links between HIV and property grabbing in Mukono, IJM Kampala has integrated programmatic activities to address both issues. IJM Kampala currently has three lawyers, three investigators, and three aftercare specialists on staff managing approximately 150\textsuperscript{18} cases annually. They provide a combination of legal, social, and health support services to women and their families.

**Legal Education**

IJM runs full-day legal education sessions, approximately 15 a year, in various communities in Mukono. Vulnerable populations, including widows, their dependents, and orphans comprise a large part of the population for these sessions. Legal education staff explain complex land and succession laws, introduce safeguards like wills and marriage formalization, answer questions about the intersection of cultural beliefs and the law, and connect property-grabbing victims to IJM lawyers by conducting case intake sessions.

In conjunction with the legal education sessions, IJM conducts will-writing clinics for both married couples and widows. The existence of a will dramatically reduces the vulnerability of widows and orphans to disinheritance when their husband or parent dies. Yet, IJM’s baseline study\textsuperscript{19} in 2007 found that 92 percent of those surveyed had not written a will, and 45 percent said they had simply never thought of writing a will. The study also revealed that community members had misconceptions about preparing a will. Many people thought it meant one was likely to die soon or had HIV. These misconceptions are dispelled during will-writing clinics and IJM staff members help clients with the necessary documents.

**Legal Services**

IJM also works within existing legal structures in their efforts to prevent disinheritance and property grabbing. Potential clients\textsuperscript{20} are identified from the legal education sessions or by referral from partner organizations. A preliminary investigation is then conducted to determine if the potential client’s property ownership rights have been violated or are under legitimate threat, and if compelling factors such as violence or fraud are present. Based upon the results of this investigation, IJM staff members decide whether to accept the case. If IJM is not able to handle the case, they refer the client to the appropriate services or organizations. If a widow does not have a marriage certificate or will, IJM may still be able to represent her children’s inheritance rights if paternity can be proven. The two main mechanisms for resolving cases are

---

\textsuperscript{16} These statistics represent a snapshot of currently active cases as of May 2012, and are not inclusive of historical statistics

\textsuperscript{17} \url{http://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/uganda/}

\textsuperscript{18} IJM Kampala currently has an active caseload of 155 cases. They typically successfully resolve and close about 40 cases a year, impacting about 160 clients. In 2011, IJM resolved 44 cases, bringing relief to 181 widows and orphans.

\textsuperscript{19} This was a cross-sectional descriptive study that IJM conducted in 2007 which surveyed 105 members of the general public, 115 widows, and 109 orphans in the district of Mukono.

\textsuperscript{20} All services are provided free of charge to IJM clients.
mediation between the disputing parties, with the local council leaders (LCs) and the court system. Approximately 90 percent of IJM’s successful cases are resolved through mediation each year, with 10 percent requiring legal representation in court. Court victories are only possible if a client has official documentation, such as a marriage certificate, will, or child’s birth certificate that demonstrates their relationship to the deceased.

Aftercare Services
IJM’s aftercare specialists play a key role in empowering victims of property grabbing and providing them with physical, economic, and emotional support. After IJM decides to take on a case, the aftercare specialists conduct an initial needs assessment with the victim and her family members and dependents. The assessment measures the needs of the client against benchmarks in the following areas: economic self-sufficiency, health status, psychosocial stability, social/community support, food supply, housing, and children’s education. The aftercare specialists then design a treatment plan tailored to the client, combining multiple services provided by both IJM staff and partner organizations, including food rations and medical and psychosocial support.

During each client needs assessment, the aftercare specialist asks about known HIV status, willingness to test for HIV and current sexual activity. IJM does not require clients to test for HIV but does encourage testing. If a client decides to take an HIV test, the aftercare specialist accompanies the client to get tested and provides psychosocial support: clients who test negative are counseled on HIV prevention; aftercare specialists encourage widows, who can be vulnerable in new sexual relationships, to demand their right to safe sex. Aftercare specialists also counsel widows on how to negotiate condom use and connect them with organizations providing free condoms or education.

For clients living with HIV, aftercare specialists encourage adherence to antiretroviral (ARV) therapy and help them overcome barriers to adherence. Clients who need specialized care are referred to hospitals or other organizations that provide HIV counseling, testing, care, and treatment for their clients. When necessary, IJM helps to cover the costs of medical treatment. IJM’s partner organizations include the National Community of Women Living with AIDS (NACWOLA), which has a dispensary for antiretroviral medications, as well as a comprehensive health care center inclusive of education services surrounding prevention of mother-to-child transmission. IJM also refers clients to The AIDS Support Organisation (TASO), where clients can meet peer counselors.

Clients are also connected to partner organizations for school sponsorship for children or income-generating programs that promote financial security and independence. Throughout the case, aftercare specialists follow-up with clients on a monthly basis, and sometimes more frequently, depending on the clients’ needs. When a case has been successfully resolved, IJM then follows up with the clients after six months.

Monitoring and Evaluation
IJM routinely collects confidential case file and client monitoring data, a practice that has been critical to its success. The data inform advocacy efforts with local and national government officials to correct the inefficiencies identified within the public justice system. Monitoring data are used to enhance intervention strategies and better serve the needs of the target population.

IJM tracks the number of legal education sessions held per year and basic demographic information on attendees, including gender and education level. Approximately 80-100 community members attend each session. They also capture the number of religious leaders and civic leaders present. Legal education staff members assess participants’ knowledge before and after
the event using a combination of group questioning (in which participants raise their hands in response to various true and false questions related to what widows are entitled to inherit) and exit interviews.

For every activity related to the case (e.g., visiting a government office, etc.), IJM staff log the activity into an internal, confidential web-based Case Tracking and Management System (CTMS) (See Box 1). The activity log is used to identify roadblocks in the formal judicial system that staff then use for advocacy efforts to improve policies and laws. The log includes the objective of the activity, participants, new contacts made, any documents obtained or submitted, and results and roadblocks. A narrative about the activity may also be included.

To assess whether property grabbing cases have decreased among widows and orphans since IJM services have been available, IJM conducted a cross-sectional baseline survey among 105 members of the general public, as well as particular sub-populations including 115 widows and 109 orphans in Mukono in 2007. IJM is currently conducting a midline survey. Another follow-up survey will be conducted in 2015 to assess the impact and effectiveness of IJM’s project activities in Mukono. These studies—which will include quantitative household surveys as well as qualitative government case file reviews, interviews and focus groups—will yield important information on the performance of the public justice system and provide an estimate of the prevalence of disinheritance in Mukono among widows and orphans. In addition, they will assess changes in property grabbing victimization rates, public understanding of the relevant law, public attitudes towards property grabbing, and government responses to property grabbing. The study data will be used in concert with the program monitoring data to inform future interventions, education and reform efforts, and advocacy efforts to foster structural changes in the legal system and process in Uganda.
Box 1: Comprehensive Monitoring: IJM's Case Tracking and Management System (CTMS)

IJM does an exemplary job of monitoring program activities, and has a model data collection and storage system. The information they collect related to their property grabbing cases is fairly comprehensive. IJM maintains confidential case files on every case referred, investigated and accepted. These case files contain data about the progress and achievements of each legal case, as well as the care history and status of all clients. All case achievement and client care data are sex disaggregated. IJM sets and tracks targets for all project outcomes, and they report on progress monthly to IJM international headquarters. 21

The following are examples of critical case progression and achievement statistics that IJM tracks:

- achievement of victim relief 22
- arrest, charge or conviction of accused perpetrators
- completion of client’s needs assessment
- services provided to the client
- case progression timelines
- number of clients actively following their treatment/care plans

Information is typically entered into CTMS in the Kampala office upon return from client visits or other case activities. Investigators also carry portable scanners so they can scan important documents, such as land deeds or marriage certificates, and save electronic copies in the client’s profile in CTMS. In the future IJM may purchase handheld devices for staff to bring into the field, which would act as “mobile CTMS units.”

Results

Since 2008 IJM has led 80 legal education programs and reached approximately 5,941 community members in Mukono District. IJM also has trained 613 Local Council leaders and 556 religious leaders on their role in protecting victims of property grabbing. IJM has successfully resolved 88 cases since it began working in Mukono, bringing secure livelihoods and restoration to 654 victims of property grabbing. The ability to keep their land has been life-changing for the HIV-affected widows whom IJM has helped.

“Owning property gave me the means to buy my ARVs and provide for my children. Now I'm a peer counselor and part of an HIV drama group. I am respected, valued and happy.”

—Constance, IJM client

In addition to preventing disinheritance in the majority of cases, IJM’s aftercare services have enhanced the financial security of their clients by linking them with local non-governmental organizations through their aftercare program. For example, Constance used her savings and the financial management and business skills she gained from a local jewelry-making NGO to open a piggery that now provides additional income for her family. Similarly, Robinah and Hamisi, a married couple assisted by IJM, were supported to start a brick making business that has enabled them to buy a plot of land and build a house with an extra room that they plan to rent to further enhance their economic stability.
Another important outcome of IJM’s efforts thus far has been the recent implementation of the CTMS system, which allows for monthly monitoring and reporting of activities and challenges. The ability to capture and analyze data in real time has increased IJM’s efficiency in terms of response times to client’s emerging needs through improved internal communication, streamlined investigation, and representation. CTMS will also help them to alter their activities to better meet the needs of clients. The system has the ability to link individuals, such as perpetrators, to multiple cases. This will enable IJM to track repeat offenders of property grabbing and provide effective safety plans for its clients.

CTMS allows IJM to track the attendance rates of judges, magistrates, and prosecutors in IJM cases. The system also allows IJM to track the failure rate of meetings in government offices, such as the Administrator General (AG), the Land Registry and the Local Council (LC), tracking specific causes of failure and their frequency. While these are challenging obstacles for IJM’s trained staff to overcome, they are virtually insurmountable obstacles for an impoverished widow without assistance. It is equally challenging to get all family members, particularly those who are perpetrating the disinheritance, to be present at mediations with the AG, the Sub-County Chief or the LC, which can significantly delay the resolution of cases. IJM also identified the constant turnover in local police officers as a barrier to the sustainability of legal education and awareness raising efforts. As a result, police officers who must enforce the laws need to be repeatedly sensitized about issues of property grabbing and the land rights of widows and orphans. IJM’s CTMS system will continue to help the office quantify the roadblocks experienced by widows and orphans seeking to protect their inheritance rights and adjust their interventions and advocacy efforts accordingly.

Challenges and Recommendations

IJM is drawing from its experience in Mukono to begin to tackle structural issues that can improve the public justice system. IJM recently launched a five-year initiative with local government partners, called Project Empaanyi to ensure more reliable and effective interventions on behalf of vulnerable widows and orphans in cases of estate administration, land-related civil disputes and criminal prosecution. Other activities that will be added to IJM’s existing program activities include: advocacy with the courts about absenteeism; assisting court systems in organizing case records and streamlining case dockets; assisting the AG’s office in increasing accessibility and efficiency in identification of estate administrators; and raising awareness of property grabbing issues among the general public through local media coverage, including national newspapers and radio.

Project Empaanyi also will address lack of knowledge and awareness among local leaders about women and orphan’s property and inheritance rights by introducing targeted trainings for local leaders and teachers, as well as county, district and federal (i.e., Justice Law and Order Sector, the Ministry of Lands) level officials, police and other authorities. At the community-level, IJM will more actively involve the faith community in awareness raising efforts and encourage their participation in activities to increase the number of community members with wills and marriage certificates.

The ultimate goal of IJM’s work is to significantly reduce widow and orphan property grabbing in Mukono by ensuring the public justice system provides a reliable, effective, and independent
intervention on behalf of widows and orphans in estate administration and victims of property grabbing in prosecution. Ultimately, as a result of these improvements, outside intervention (like IJM’s) should no longer be required for the poorest to access the benefits of the system in Mukono. In comparison to grassroots legal education, IJM’s programmatic approach is costly and may not be replicable in other contexts without significant funds. However, IJM’s holistic intervention is presumably less costly than the combined costs of the substantial loss of productivity created by insecure land tenure.25

IJM could expand programmatic efforts to foster more rapid and sustainable change by involving grassroots volunteers. Such an approach would build capacity among local women and men, foster local ownership, and more directly engage the community to safeguard WPIR and protect the rights of people living with HIV. Community volunteers could assist in identifying potential cases of property grabbing from widows and place pressure on community leaders to prevent these injustices. This model could enhance the sustainability of IJM’s efforts in Mukono and provide a more replicable model for Uganda as a whole. Through Project Empaanyi, IJM will begin to train and empower local and religious leaders in Mukono to lead community legal education programs and will writing workshops. Fostering grassroots involvement from community members would further strengthen these efforts to sustain change and maintain reductions in property grabbing.

IJM’s aftercare specialists noted that they face persistent negative attitudes about HIV in communities. In many cases, IJM clients avoid testing for HIV or adhering to ARVs because of the stigma and discrimination towards people living with HIV.

Although IJM provides social support services to assist clients living with HIV, they do not currently incorporate HIV messaging directly into their property rights related activities. Including HIV and HIV-related stigma and discrimination as topics in their legal education sessions and other capacity building activities could further strengthen the impact of their program model on reducing the negative societal impacts of HIV. It would also be useful to collect monitoring data on the stigma and discrimination experienced by their clients so they can gauge the level and influence of stigma and discrimination on uptake of HIV-related services among their clients.

Lastly, it would be beneficial to develop an M&E plan26 and prioritize evaluable questions to answer using the available data collected through its CTMS. A clearly delineated M&E plan would also ensure that relevant data are being captured to maximize proposed advocacy activities for fostering structural transformation. In addition, IJM could consider following up with clients for a longer period of time after the successful resolution of cases to assess potential long-term consequences (e.g., gender-based violence and child sexual abuse) of the resolution.27

---

25 IJM plans to work with the local government in streamlining processes which, if successful, could be used as a model for scale-up in Uganda. IJM’s capacity building interventions have the potential to make the public justice system more efficient, and could ultimately result in lower public justice system administration costs.

26 IJM Kampala is in the process of developing an M&E plan for its casework and capacity building programs, which should be finalized by December 2012.

27 More extensive follow-up is a planned improvement, using IJM’s Aftercare Successful Outcomes form which was launched in June 2012. This new standard will require that a select percentage of clients receive IJM follow-up one year following their treatment plan completion.
Grassroots Women Operating Together in Sisterhood (GROOTS)

Background

Location
The GROOTS Kenya office is in Nairobi. The geographic coverage area of their work is nationwide. GROOTS is currently made up of over 2,500 grassroots women organizations in Kenya, although the number changes frequently, as groups move in and out of the organization. GROOTS Kenya currently has eight focal points in seven provinces. Each focal point’s area of responsibility is typically the size of a district, although some are smaller and others cover three districts.

GROOTS Kenya supports grassroots organizations in the following provinces and districts, as indicated in parentheses: Central Province (Gatundu South, Gatundu North, Limuru and Nanyuki); Nairobi Province (Mathare and Kibera); Eastern Province (Kitui); Western Province (Kakamega and Busia); Nyanza Province (Karachuonyo-Kendubay and Kaspul Kabondo); Coast Province (Kilifi); and Rift Valley province (Molo).

Organizational/Program Goals
GROOTS has four program areas, one of which is women and property. This program area aims to increase awareness of the issues surrounding property inheritance for women and girls, and also to increase access to and the quality of services available to address WPIR.

Target Audiences
Target beneficiaries include women who have been affected by disinheritance, asset stripping or dispossession, widows, orphans, community members, local leaders, land board members, members of the land tribunal, officers in the ministry of gender and social services, and provincial administrators.

Primary Approaches
GROOTS’ primary approaches are legal education, public advocacy, and awareness raising.

Program Description
GROOTS is a network of women’s self-help groups and community organizations in Kenya that formed as a response to the inadequate visibility of grassroots women in development and decision-making forums that directly impact them and their communities. GROOTS’ mission is to facilitate grassroots women and their communities to effectively participate in development processes. Their goal is to strengthen the role of grassroots women in community development by serving as a platform for grassroots women’s groups and individuals to come together, share ideas and experiences, network, and find avenues to directly participate in decision making, planning, and implementation of issues that affect them. Approximately 2,500 grassroots organizations have been formed in Kenya through GROOTS. GROOTS addresses multiple gender strategies in WPIR programming including raising awareness of women’s rights, encouraging women’s participation in communities and public life, and providing legal protection and access to justice for women. GROOTS has a women and property project which aims to increase the awareness of the issues surrounding property inheritance for women and girls, and to increase...
access to and the quality of services available to address WPIR. One of the most recognizable initiatives has been the formation of community watch dog groups, which monitor and guard against property grabbing from widows and orphans in their respective communities. The watch dog groups works in tandem with HIV service providers (e.g., home based caregivers) to help identify women in need of their services and when appropriate, GROOTS refers widows and orphans to other organizations providing HIV-related services such as care and treatment. Through GROOTS, over 200 widows and orphans have been able to reclaim their land or property, over 40 community leaders have been trained to serve as community paralegals to support the protection of widows and orphans from disinheritance, and over 60 watch dog groups have formed and are continuously protecting women and their property rights in their communities.

**Activities**

*Mapping and Documentation*

Mapping and documentation is a form of investigation conducted to help gather information about women and other vulnerable groups who have been affected by disinheritance, asset stripping, or dispossession. Mapping and documentation is mainly conducted by community members in areas where there have been reports of women’s rights violations. GROOTS provides the grassroots organization with a mapping tool, and the women in the grassroots organization interview community members including the provincial administration and local government. The mapping tool that is used in this exercise specifically asks about community perception of HIV, asset control, incidence of property rights violations, and if there is a relationship between disinheritance and HIV. Grassroots women leading this process are often women living with HIV identified through GROOTS-supported home-based caregivers. Community interventions are then designed based on the findings of the mapping and documentation process.

*Formation of Watch dog Groups*

Watch dog groups are formed as a response to the community challenges and problems that are revealed through the mapping exercise. GROOTS hosts an annual planning forum for community focal points from each of the active grassroots organizations. During these forums, focal points and GROOTS staff determine which areas to focus on during the upcoming year. In these forums, individual members of the grassroots organizations share problems or issues they have observed in their respective areas. If the problem is around land rights, GROOTS arranges for these organizations to be trained in using the mapping tool, provided that funding is available for representatives to be trained. A mapping exercise is then undertaken during which the magnitude and extent of women’s land rights violations and property disinheritance is investigated. Where appropriate, volunteer watch dog groups are then formed to combat these issues. These groups often include women living with HIV who experienced property grabbing, as well as home-based caregivers.

Watch dog groups help detect land and property rights violations, and aim to protect widows and orphans against asset stripping, disinheritance, and dispossession by drawing attention to these issues and serving as mediators. They maintain paper records to keep track of the status of the cases and the number of persons affected. There are currently 51 active watch dog groups, each with about 15 to 20 members. As part of their awareness raising efforts, watch dog groups have used mass birth registration and identity card drives to educate women on the importance of documents to safeguard inheritance.

*Local to Local Dialogue*

Local to Local dialogue is an advocacy platform between the communities and their leaders at the local level. The local leaders are mainly members of the provincial administration including
land board members, members of the land tribunal, and officers in the ministry of gender and social services where land and other property issues are discussed. Community members are initially trained in how to conduct and facilitate local to local dialogues. During this forum, the community highlights the land and property problems they are facing and discusses how local leaders could help prevent and mitigate property grabbing. The commitments made by the duty bearers during these dialogues are recorded in the form of meeting minutes. Members of the watch dog groups then follow up with the duty bearers to hold them accountable for their commitments. This helps to enhance accountability and partnership in the community, and ensures representation at the community level. As a result of local to local dialogues, the number of women in key decision making bodies has increased.

**Peer Exchange**

Peer exchange is an activity held by the watch dog groups in order to share experiences among people of different regions. Periodically GROOTS will fund some watch dog groups to visit other watch dog groups. During peer exchanges, groups from different regions share their achievements, challenges, and lessons learned from dealing with land and other property violations. This helps to build the capacity of the watch dog groups and targets communities whose watch dog groups have difficulties in addressing property rights violations. GROOTS identifies the need for a peer exchange through an informal feedback mechanism, or through monitoring forms if the group is part of a funded project that collects data.

**Training of Community Paralegals and Documentation**

This is an activity that aims to empower grassroots community members by training them on legal issues surrounding WPIR and how to keep records and other evidence. GROOTS funds about five members of each new watch dog group to go through a paralegal training which lasts from one to two weeks each month for eight months. One paralegal training is held every year. After completing the course, the ‘paralegals’ transfer the skills learned to the other members of their respective watch dog groups.

**Audio-based information education**

In 2005, GROOTS recorded grassroots women talking about their experiences with disinheritance on audio cassettes. There are currently four cassettes with the voices of disinherit women, provincial officials, and paralegals talking about steps to take to solve disinheritance cases. The watch dog groups have copies of the cassettes, and play them for groups of people in their communities. This activity targets women who are experiencing property violations but are not speaking up, and aims to help them talk about what they are experiencing.

**Measurement, Results, and Challenges**

**Measurement Strategies**

Before watch dog groups join GROOTS, they go through a community led mapping process which is conducted using a structured questionnaire administered by local members of the community. The grassroots women interview people in the community and local government officials. The aim is to collect the number of affected persons in each vulnerable household identified as having tenure problems and to document the main factors contributing to property and inheritance rights violations. The mapping tool collects qualitative information about community perception of HIV, asset control, incidence of property rights violations, and if there is a relationship between disinheritance and HIV, and the tool is adapted to each community. The mapping is a transgenerational group effort, and young people who have gone to school help translate Kiswahili to English and record information during the interviews on the forms.
Because of the extensiveness of the GROOTS network throughout Kenya (approximately 2,500 women in 51 watch dog groups in seven provinces), and the nature of the ‘from the ground up’ movement, systematic program monitoring is difficult. For grassroots volunteers, collecting monitoring data can be challenging due to both human capacity and time constraints. GROOTS does not do systematic monitoring or evaluation of their programs unless they have specific funding which requests them to track activities and outcomes.

Data collection among the watch dogs and home based caregivers is not currently systematic, but each watch dog group is trained in record keeping, and encouraged to maintain a client register and a follow-up register to track the number of cases handled each year and the status of each case. The register tracks the nature of the client’s case, the stakeholders involved, and the intervention strategy. Home based caregivers complete standardized checklists at each initial client visit and the checklists are kept on file at the local GROOTS offices. Most of the data are not computerized, but in areas where groups have access to a computer and electricity, the property rights monitoring data is transferred into a word document and saved electronically. To strengthen the capacity of the watch dog groups to collect and enter monitoring data, GROOTS recently began training a few women per watch dog group in computer skills, documentation, information management, and data entry. GROOTS has also given computers to 10 of the 51 groups. Monitoring data are intended to be reported to the GROOTS secretariat on a monthly basis; the frequency of reporting, however, varies based on the capacity and time availability of the volunteer watch dogs and home based caregivers.

Key Findings and Lessons
The GROOTS model of empowering the grassroots to identify and respond to key issues and concerns in their own communities has been very successful at enabling communities across Kenya to respond to the HIV epidemic and the ensuing increase in property grabbing from women and orphans affected by HIV. There are currently 10,050 home-based caregivers trained using the GROOTS home-based care curriculum and an estimated 765 watch dog members throughout the seven regions in Kenya. The integration of home-based care and watch dog services in 51 communities has resulted in faster identification of potential property grabbing cases, which in turn enabled preventive mediation in many cases or more timely mediation after property grabbing occurred.

One of the most striking outcomes of GROOTS’ work with grassroots women has been the rise in women’s leadership. Women who served as home-based caregivers and watch dog members are seen as well-informed and articulate about key issues affecting their communities. A number of women active in the grassroots groups have been selected to serve as a village chief or assistant chief. In several communities, women who were previously home-based care workers or watch dogs serve on district land boards, which are responsible for demarcating land after the death of a landowner, and as ombudspersons, who lead mediations about land disputes in the community. More women on key decision-making bodies in the community helps to protect WPIR. Empowering grassroots women to participate in local government and influence policymaking is critical in order to institutionalize the protection of women’s and orphan’s property and inheritance rights in Kenya.

Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes
GROOTS has faced the following challenges:
• Some African cultures, especially in Luo Nyanza in western and central Kenya, do not support women to own land and property.
• Most of the duty bearers are men and the patriarchal orientation in most parts of Kenya causes many men to resist involvement in property rights initiatives.
• There is very little knowledge about property rights at the grassroots level.
• Many women are not ready to speak up about how they have been disinherited due to fear of further abuse from their in-laws.
• The government officers at the grassroots level are at times not entirely cooperative.

GROOTS has addressed these challenges by:
• Winning the support of male leaders, through peer exchange visits.
• Developing mentored women leaders who can spearhead protection of women’s land rights.
• Holding various trainings and sensitization forums to help educate grassroots women on their property and inheritance rights.
• Training community paralegals and using testimonies from other regions as to how women have been able to fight for their inheritance rights.
• Using ‘pressure groups’ in the form of watch dog groups to encourage the support of local development officers’ involvement and interest in WPIR.

Additional Information

Program References and Resources
• GROOTS Taking Action booklet
• GROOTS Kenya brochure
• GROOTS Women, Land and Property brochure
• GROOTS website: http://www.groots.org/members/kenya.htm

Contact Information

Website
http://www.groots.org/members/kenya.htm

Address
PO Box 10320-GPO
Nairobi, Kenya

Phone
+254-2718977 or +254-27783640

Email
Esther Mwaura: grootsk@grootskenya.org
Kenya Legal and Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDs (KELIN)

**Background**

**Location**
Nairobi; Kisumu and Homa Bay Counties

**Organizational/Program Goals**
KELIN is a non-governmental organization that strives to promote health and human rights in Kenya and internationally.

**Target Audiences**
Women living with HIV, women vulnerable to HIV, widows, orphans and vulnerable children, and community elders

**Primary Approaches**
KELIN's primary approaches are advocacy, training, legal arbitration, and resettlement

**Program Description**
KELIN advocates for the promotion, respect, and protection of health and HIV-related human rights. In particular, KELIN serves widows and orphans by upholding their inheritance rights, and facilitating their access to legal arbitration and resettlement. KELIN engages in advocacy campaigns that promote awareness of human rights issues among government leaders, organizations and community members. KELIN staff train community elders, widows, district and provincial administrators, and women-led community-based organizations to create awareness of human rights and the rights of people living with HIV and to build their capacity to implement sound programming. KELIN assists with mediation of cases, providing legal services and support to people who have suffered human rights violations—especially people living with HIV or those affected by health issues. This includes facilitating access to alternative dispute resolution services by widows who have been disinherited of their property because of their HIV status.

**Activities**

**Identification of Disinherited Widows and Orphans in Need of Services**
KELIN’s clients are primarily people with HIV-related legal problems, including disinherited widows and orphans. To identify potential clients, KELIN has held informational meetings with representatives of PLHIV networks, government officials, community elders and widows groups, introducing them to KELIN’s services and training them in rights-based approaches. They in turn speak about KELIN’s work through various platforms, including radio and television, raising awareness about KELIN’s activities and referring those individuals who may benefit from such support. Community-based widows groups link disinherited widows to KELIN’s project coordinator who in turn presents their case to an elder’s cultural structures system. The community-based widows groups are located in Nyando, Nyakach, Muhoroni, and Kasipul Kabondo constituencies in Kisumu and Homa Bay counties, which are locations with high rates of HIV infection and widow disinheritance.

**Training and Sensitization**
KELIN has conducted two four-day training and sensitization workshops for elders, widows, district and provincial administrators, law enforcement officials, and CBOs for women, including widows groups. On the first day, KELIN trains the women CBO members, and on
the second day, the elders. For the remaining two days, KELIN brings all participants together. The elders and beneficiaries are trained on human rights, alternative dispute resolution approaches, succession law, and property ownership rights issues. Elders are also sensitized on how to integrate HIV prevention messages into dispute resolution in an attempt to influence behavioral norms in the community. For example, elders learn about reducing HIV risk during the traditional practice of ‘sexual cleansing’ of widows. Future trainings are planned on provisions of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 as they relate to women’s rights and WPIR, and these trainings will target children of widows, orphans, elders, and widows groups. These trainings will also serve as a venue for KELIN to share a toolkit they have developed on working with community elders to increase access to legal justice by widows and other vulnerable groups.

Mediation of Cases
KELIN links widows who have property inheritance cases to mediation services provided by community elders. If a client agrees, KELIN takes her to the Luo Council of Elders or any other constituted structure of elders in the region for mediation of her case. The elders upon receiving the information from KELIN carry out their own investigation and speak both to the widow and the party with whom she has a conflict, usually her in-laws, separately. The elders then convene both parties to meet and commence the mediation process. The elders facilitate the mediation process by allowing each party to tell their side of the story and guide them toward promoting a peaceful settlement. KELIN is sometimes allowed to sit in on the mediations but does not influence the process. If a client requires ongoing legal representation, KELIN will make arrangements for a private lawyer to represent the client on a pro bono basis, although this need has never arisen since the inception of the project. On average, KELIN provides legal advice to five clients a month.

Resettlement of Women and Orphans
After the mediation process has resulted in a favorable resolution, the women then resettle in the area with assistance from community members. The elders inform the community about the resettlement. Sometimes KELIN goes with the elders to talk to the community. In some instances, a semi-permanent house is constructed for the most vulnerable widows. KELIN has limited resources, and therefore cannot provide housing for everyone in need. The widows in the area decide which one of them should have a house built for them based on need. Once a widow has been chosen for a new structure, she and the elders will mobilize the community to donate their labor to build the house. KELIN provides some of the materials.

Measurement, Results, and Challenges
Measurement Strategies
When clients are referred to KELIN, the project coordinator sits with them and fills out a ‘Widows Details Form.’ This form collects detailed information about each client, including demographics, the problem for which help is sought, the deceased and their beneficiaries, assets and liabilities, etc. If during the course of intake, the client reveals her HIV status, this information is noted on a separate document that is kept in a file that only the program coordinator can access. In addition to the initial intake form, the program coordinator follows up with the widows on a monthly basis and collects information on a ‘follow-up form’ about the current status of the widow’s situation and actions to be taken. The original form filled out by the clients and the follow-up form are both entered into a Word document. KELIN plans to move all forms over to an Access database with additional funding.

The elders also collect information/take notes during the mediation process and enter this information in a notebook (not a structured form). The project coordinator and the elders keep
track of the number of cases identified, number of mediations in process, number of mediations completed, and the outcomes of the mediations. ‘Case study videos’ about specific clients have also been created for advocacy and awareness purposes.

KELIN currently uses the data generated on the number of cases and the outcomes of the cases in donor reports that are produced approximately every six months. To date, KELIN has not had a systematic monitoring and evaluation plan, but they received funding in early 2012 to develop one for their program. The evaluation will focus on how the widows and elders are impacted by the training KELIN conducts on WPIR in light of the new provisions of the 2010 Constitution. An independent external evaluator will seek to understand how the elders, widows, and orphans have utilized and responded to the training materials, whether they have taken a more active stance on the issues, particularly around promoting human rights in the community and if the activities they have conducted reflect the intent of the training. It is envisioned that this type of information will be collected, analyzed, and presented in a (subsequent) training workshop report and in an external evaluation report.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

Approximately 120 elders have participated in discussions on a rights-based approach to mediation as part of KELIN’s training and sensitization workshop sessions. Elders’ exchanges have also taken place, with elders from other communities visiting the elders KELIN works with to understand how the project works, in hopes of replicating it. Successful mediations have been tracked by KELIN, and 77 of 132 cases have been mediated successfully since 2009. In addition, 17 semi-permanent houses have been built for the most vulnerable widows and their children within a 36-month period. A huge demand remains, as there are an additional 30 widows who need houses, but no funds currently exist to support them.

KELIN hopes that the application of human rights principles by elders to resolve inheritance disputes will be integrated into local norms, enabling the approach to become largely self-sustaining. KELIN’s role will likely decrease as the human rights approach is taken up more broadly in the community although there will be some ongoing need for capacity building and support from KELIN. KELIN and other agencies may also need to continue to act as referral points for cases that require intervention by the formal legal system. KELIN also notes that the elders’ voluntary work in mediation cases needs to be recognized by the government and is seeking ways to foster this recognition.

While KELIN does not have the capacity or resources to scale-up the approach nationally, the organization feels that demonstrating the effectiveness of the approach in the two counties where they are working will help catalyze interest and support to expand to other regions.

The Luo community in Kisumu and Homa Bay Counties was chosen as the site for project activities due to the dominant cultural framework that prohibits women from owning land and the high HIV prevalence. KELIN’s approach would need to be adjusted if applied to communities where customary law and traditions are different or where there are multiple cultural, traditional, and religious systems operating alongside each other.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**

Women do not always disclose their HIV status and KELIN finds that as a result, it can be challenging to ensure that women receive the appropriate services. Whether women have disclosed their status or not, they are advised to monitor their health, eat well, and visit a clinic if they feel sick. Acquisition of property title deeds has proven to be difficult, because the current land-holders (often family of the deceased), suspect that the widow will sell the land for a profit
instead of living on it. KELIN addresses this suspicion by providing legal information to the in-laws and facilitating communication between the widow and her in-laws. Acquisition of title deeds commences once all parties have consented.

The village elders who help with arbitration are volunteers, and getting enough of their time has been difficult, as they often have a variety of other issues commanding their attention. KELIN addresses this by motivating the elders through training, as well as lobbying the government to recognize their efforts. The use of alternative dispute resolution methods is now recognized in article 159 of the Kenyan Constitution and was a direct result of KELIN’s lobbying.

**Additional Information**

**Program References and Resources**

- Video discussing the cultural structures project: [http://kelinkenya.org/multimedia/video/](http://kelinkenya.org/multimedia/video/)

**Contact Information**

**Website**

**Address**
PO Box 112-00202,
KNH Nairobi, Kenya

**Phone**
+254-20-2515790 or +254-20-3861596 (Nairobi office)
+254-574532664 (Kisumu office)
+254-717261408 or +254-788220300 (cell)

**Email**
Mr. Allan Achesa Maleche: [info@kelinkenya.org](mailto:info@kelinkenya.org) or [amaleche@kelinkenya.org](mailto:amaleche@kelinkenya.org)
Young Widows Advancement Program (YWAP)

Background

Location
Nairobi (Kayole Estate); Rachuonyo and Siaya districts

Organizational/Program Goals
The Young Widows Advancement Program (YWAP) promotes the interests of widows and orphans by raising awareness of the protection of their sexual, property, and inheritance rights. YWAP values a productive and healthy family life for all of its members and builds the capacity of widows to successfully create the foundation to manage their family’s welfare.

Target Audiences
Target beneficiaries include widows and their children, persons with terminal illnesses, and community members.

Primary Approaches
YWAP’s primary approaches are community sensitization, capacity building, legal empowerment, and psychosocial support.

Program Description
YWAP’s programming efforts focus on the strengthening and/or restoration of the property rights of widows. First organized in 1997, YWAP is active in five programmatic areas that target widows and their children residing in Kayole estate including the following:

• advocacy
• paralegal services including mediation, legal aid, and conflict resolution, led by trained community based volunteers
• operation of a “rescue center” for widows who have been evicted, women who have experienced or been threatened by some type of violence in their attempt to defend their land and/or property, and the children of these women
• psychosocial support groups for family members infected with and/or affected by HIV
• preparation of memory books and wills

Activities

Sensitization Campaigns
YWAP offers numerous sensitization and awareness campaigns as part of its overall strategy to enhance and strengthen the property and inheritance rights of women living with HIV and mitigate the impact of HIV. Past sensitization campaigns involved the dissemination of information, education and communication (IEC) materials on WPIR, and media campaigns on women living with HIV.

YWAP trained 25 women from local women’s groups in 2007 and 2011 in a three-day workshop on raising awareness of inheritance issues and becoming advocates in WPIR. Led by representatives from the Legal Resources Foundation, topics covered in these workshops included legal information (such land policies in the Kenyan Constitution) and how to advocate for widows. These trained outreach volunteers continue to carry out sensitization activities for YWAP. As of May 2012, YWAP conducted eight sensitization workshops, including a half-day workshop where YWAP staff presented at a plenary session on WPIR.
**Bereavement Counseling**

YWAP has a bereavement counselor on staff who serves as the first point of contact for a YWAP participant. Participants learn about YWAP either from community sensitization activities or through membership with a local network. Upon intake, the bereavement counselor determines what type of assistance a young widow needs to support her efforts to reclaim her property. During this process, the counselor determines if the participant requires legal aid. The bereavement counselor also educates widows living with HIV on their right to access HIV care and treatment at available public centers, and makes referrals to these centers. YWAP also provides these women with links to housing, small business development education, seed money, and nutrition assistance if needed.

Bereavement counseling has been offered since YWAP’s inception, and is available to any participant who requests it. On average, in one week the counselor will see anywhere from one to five new clients in addition to facilitating eight psychosocial support groups for widows living with HIV and their children. Between 2010 and 2011, 406 young widows received bereavement counseling from YWAP.

**Legal Assistance**

YWAP has trained about 50 paralegals to provide legal aid to clients who require these services. YWAP has a legal aid officer who helps liaise between bereavement counselors and paralegals and coordinate property and inheritance case referrals. Since February 2012, 54 YWAP clients have received assistance from these paralegals. Through YWAP, clients also have access to a lawyer who provides pro bono legal assistance should their case require legal intervention.

In 2007 and 2011, 50 male and female community members were trained in succession planning for HIV by YWAP paralegals. Male property owners were the primary targets of this training and most of the participants were living with HIV. Women Fighting AIDS in Kenya (WOFAK), a local NGO partner that supports the empowerment of women living with HIV, assisted with the identification of candidates for the training. The participants were trained in a variety of topics including how to disclose one’s HIV status, how to discuss property issues with family members, preparation of wills and memory books, and how to appoint guardians and executors of wills. Volunteers trained in succession planning then serve as immediate resources to assist community members with the writing of wills and negotiation of inheritance rights.

**Assisting Kayole Widows in Gaining Control of Family Property and Land**

This project took place between 2008 and 2010 and involved assisting widows who had moved from the Rachuonyo and Siaya districts of Nyanza to Kayole, a low-income area on the outskirts of Nairobi, following the deaths of their husbands and subsequent loss of property and land. Spurred by the fact that little research had been undertaken to understand the factors that inhibit a young widow’s ownership, access, and control of land, Makerere Institute of Social Research approached YWAP and other organizations in Kenya and Uganda working on WPIR issues to serve as local research partners. Through formative research they were able to document the consequences of the loss of a widows’ inheritance and property rights. The findings were shared with policy makers and subsequently informed the development of public policy based solutions to these issues.

This study collected quantitative data through a household survey and qualitative data through in-depth interviews with 108 widows. Additional qualitative data was collected through focus group discussions conducted with the women group leaders, women opinion leaders, and male chiefs. Qualitative data collected from the widows indicated that in those situations where the
husband was suspected of having died from an AIDS-related illness, the widow frequently reported being blamed by family and community members for his death. Of those widows currently engaged in land disputes, over 80 percent reported being entwined in a land dispute with their in-laws. Results from this study and five additional studies that helped gather evidence on the need to develop policies that better support WPIR were shared with East African policymakers during a meeting convened by the funders of this research, the International Development Research Center (IDRC) and the International Land Coalition (ILC).

Measurement, Results, and Challenges

Measurement Strategies
As part of the client intake process with bereavement counseling, demographic information and information on the health needs of the widow and her children are documented. If a widow requires legal aid, the bereavement counselor completes a form that enables the widow to seek counsel from a paralegal. The paralegal also has a form that s/he completes upon the first meeting with the referred participant that notes the participant’s demographic information such as age, sex, and marital status, and documents the details of the property rights case. Both the bereavement counselors and paralegals document individual grievances and collect information about the widow’s past attempts to reclaim grabbed land and property. This information is stored in notebooks in which the paralegals keep notes from their meetings with the participants and document next steps.

YWAP conducts monthly feedback meetings with the paralegals, advocacy volunteers, and succession volunteers where they provide information on what activities have taken place. At these meetings, the bereavement counselor and legal aid officer provide weekly activity reports that are shared with YWAP staff. The legal aid officer reports on the number of cases she received as referrals from the bereavement counselor. The bereavement counselors report on the number of new clients received, and the number of complaints and actions. The information discussed in these monthly meetings is shared with donors on a quarterly basis.

As mentioned previously, for the Kayole widows project, YWAP collected both quantitative and qualitative data in the form of structured questionnaires, focus group discussions, and in-depth interviews with program participants, women group leaders, and opinion leaders. The structured questionnaire captured the widow’s profile (e.g., age, number of children, length of widowhood), details about her land (e.g., how land was acquired, current use of land, if documentation around ownership exists), details about land disputes (e.g., if they exist and how are they resolved), land ownership patterns, and factors that inhibit the widow’s inheritance of land such as the role of the legal system, local knowledge of land rights, and causes of disinheritance. The project data was stored in log books and matrices. Some data, notably data from the structured questionnaire, were computerized. A data analysis plan was created, and frequencies as well as an analysis of the emerging themes in the qualitative data were reported in the evaluation report.

Key Findings and Lessons
YWAP’s research shows that existing legal and policy frameworks have not been effective in protecting WPIR, as enforcement of these rights are often severely hampered due to the inefficient legal structures that are in place to uphold these rights. Organizations and networks that work on WPIR must build their capacity in order to support intensive advocacy efforts, and develop and implement interventions that help women navigate the legal justice system and uphold their inheritance rights.
Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes
YWAP finds that the gap between statutory law and actual practice looms large. Widows face serious challenges in fulfilling their rights when the law is poorly implemented or when social and economic restrictions impede women from using the law to claim their rights. Widows oftentimes lack the legally recognized identification documents, such as birth certificates and identification cards, to access formal justice systems. Furthermore, widows who have limited education perceive the formal justice system as time consuming and burdensome and would therefore rather engage in activities like petty trade that result in faster investment, as opposed to seeking legal retribution against in-laws who have disinherited or evicted these women.

YWAP also notes that building collaborative networks and referral systems is difficult because NGOs, FBOs, and CBOs are concentrated primarily in Western Nairobi, making them physically less accessible for organizations like YWAP which are located in the Eastern Nairobi.

Additional Information

Program References and Resources
International Land Coalition (http://www.landcoalition.org)
ICRW (http://www.icrw.org)

Contact Information

Website
currently unavailable

Address
Kayole 1, Spine Road,
Opposite Kayole Secondary School
Nairobi, Kenya

Phone
+254-721931397 or +254-020788657

Email
Esther Angudha: ywidows@yahoo.com or info@youngwidowskenya.org
Gulu Women’s Economic Development and Globalization (GWED-G)

**Background**

**Location**
Gulu and Amuru districts, Uganda

**Organizational/Program Goals**
GWED-G aims to strengthen the capacity of grassroots communities in northern Uganda to become self-reliant agents of change and empower their members to live in a world that is free from discrimination and poverty.

**Target Audiences**
The target audiences are women including pregnant and non-pregnant women living with HIV, men (including these women’s partners), youth, human rights education groups, elderly persons, and community members-at-large.

**Primary Approaches**
GWED-G’s primary approaches are mediation training and community sensitization.

**Program Description**
GWED-G promotes human rights, access to justice, and the prevention of sexual and gender-based violence. GWED-G’s programming reflects its organizational vision of creating a world where women at the grassroots level can live free from discrimination, poverty, and violence. GWED-G offers an array of activities and support services that enable community members to uphold and defend their human rights. A key activity is training community members on human rights so that they may subsequently assist and provide mediation to fellow community members who have experienced a grievance of that nature. GWED-G’s core activities also include community sensitization around women’s property rights and utilizing mechanisms of justice such as Human Rights Volunteers (HRVs) and the courts.

**Activities**

*Promoting Women’s Property Rights and Their Participation in Decision Making Processes*
GWED-G became aware of the need for various types of support for women in Paicho and Unyama sub-counties in Gulu District who were landless because of war or other reasons including HIV. In response, GWED-G brought together these women into five groups of 30 members each, and trained them in human rights, including women’s rights and property rights. Their training covered the Convention to End Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), UN International Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights (ECSR) and other laws and conventions upholding human rights and inheritance rights.

After the training, the groups of women engage in community mobilization and awareness raising activities, including the performance of dramas highlighting human rights issues. One
group in particular that included some women living with HIV became empowered to submit a proposal to the sub-county land committee requesting land for future use. The proposal was approved and the women received a small plot of land. These women anticipate engaging in income generation activities on this property. It is envisioned that with GWED-G’s support, these women will gain the inputs to farm this land, grow crops for sale, and use the income earned to purchase additional land.

**Promoting Access to Justice for War Affected Communities of Northern Uganda**

Since 2009, GWED-G has supported 20 HRVs in Amuru District who have been trained in human rights, specifically on WPIR especially those that pertain to widows, and the rights of PLHIV to access HIV treatment and medical services; the monitoring of human rights abuses/violations; and how to lobby, advocate, and network with other groups to realize these rights. The HRVs, who were identified by community members and then recruited and trained by GWED-G, are educated members of society typically schooled in law or policy who report human rights violations and serve as a resource to facilitate the mediation process, whether it involves a land conflict or a violent crime. HRVs also refer women to local lawyers to seek legal action for disputes that are not resolved through mediation. In addition to their initial training, the HRVs undergo refresher training in human rights every year. The individuals that seek assistance from HRVs are often self-referred.

GWED-G has also trained 95 Amuru District community officials, including police officers, LC1 chairpersons, sub-county Land Committee members, opinion leaders, and women parish representatives, in a series of human rights sessions, including one that was exclusively on WPIR. In this particular training, participants became educated on issues around access, ownership and decision-making processes concerning property and inheritance, and barriers and challenges to upholding women’s property rights.

**Community Mobilization**

GWED-G, in partnership with Justice and Peace Commission (JPC), formed women networks and Rapid Action Teams (RATs) in Gulu District to mobilize community stakeholders to encourage community dialogue on social factors, such as harmful gender norms and gender-based violence that impact a woman’s ability to defend her human rights. RATs consist of volunteer representatives who work with HRVs in documenting the human rights violations of community members. RATs are recruited in the same manner as HRVs—they are identified by community members, encouraged by GWED-G to apply for these positions, and go through an application process. Selected RAT members typically do not have the depth of formal education that HRVs possess, but they have received similar human rights training. RATs outnumber HRVs—currently there are about 100 RATs, and they have a large female membership, and serve as additional on-the-ground “eyes and ears” for the HRVs to identify issues that may require conflict resolution. As a result of the opportunities created by the RATs for community stakeholders to engage in dialogue, there is increased community awareness of the local institutional mechanisms that one can use to seek justice.

Trained women network members, including landless women organized by GWED-G, have also conducted community sensitization activities in the form of dramas to educate their communities about WPIR, and in particular, the link between WPIR and HIV. These dramas highlight situations where women living with HIV or households affected by HIV have encountered landlessness as a result of selling their property in order to raise needed funds or have been forced to defend their property and/or inheritance rights. General community beliefs toward women, HIV, and violence have experienced some improvement after these dialogues and dramas have been held.
HIV Prevention Campaign

GWED-G and GlobeMed have conducted a series of HIV prevention and family planning education sessions targeting young women, expectant mothers, and couples in Amru District. As part of this initiative, GWED-G provides referrals to prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) and antenatal care (ANC) services. Some of these women have also experienced land-related conflicts with their husbands. HRVs provide sensitization to these women on WPPIR and their linkages to HIV. On a weekly basis, HRVs participate in community sensitization events to speak on the legal aspects of HIV, and raise awareness on the rights of PLHIV to, for example, have access to medical care and in particular for women living with HIV to be involved in decision making around property.

Measurement, Results, and Challenges

Measurement Strategies

GWED-G collects case incident (monitoring) data from every subject who has sought mediation. They use a reporting tool that collects information including the complainant’s age and sex; location and cause of incident; nature of incident (was property damaged/destroyed/stolen/confiscated); the circumstances under which the incident occurred; information about the perpetrator; and notes about evidence. This information is collected at every encounter when filing a mediation case. This tool can be used to document incidents involving gender-based violence and property infractions, including those against women living with HIV. The case incident data are stored in paper form format and are not computerized. For case incidents, the HRV has a copy to take to legal proceedings and GWED-G has a copy of the same paperwork that is stored in a locked file that is kept in the HRV office that only GWED-G staff can access. The case incident data are shared monthly among GWED-G staff in terms of the case’s pending status in the justice system. The number of cases that have achieved justice are shared with district authorities on a monthly and quarterly basis.

GWED-G is also piloting a “unified” M&E tool for its human rights education program that was provided by Amnesty International for collection of quantitative (survey) baseline and impact data. (Other African countries that are implementing human rights education programs and funded by UKAID through Amnesty International are also involved in the pilot process.) Outcomes with respect to knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and behaviors are measured. GWED-G measures change in human rights policy (increase or decrease in number), change in individual activism (change in numbers of cases/incidents reported), and change in people’s lives (after receiving human rights education). These data are stored in paper form. The baseline survey data and impact data are reported back quarterly to Amnesty International. GWED-G staff analyze the data collected using this pilot tool and share findings with all implementing partners on a semi-annual and annual basis.

GWED-G documents and tracks a number of outcomes through monthly and quarterly reports shared among GWED-G staff:

- Increased number of women attending meetings on property grabbing
- Increased number of mediation cases reported
- Increased access to justice including property matters
- Increased knowledge of referral pathways that can address rights violations, specifically the HRVs

The first two outcomes are collected from case incident data. HRVs and RATs informally collect the third and fourth outcomes while talking to community members at various community sensitization events.
Key Findings and Lessons
GWED-G finds that community mobilization, sensitization, and documentation efforts can be maximized when both HRVs and RATs are involved. These human resources, who serve pro bono, are available at all levels of the mediation and reporting process for individuals seeking assistance on land management matters. Through its HRVs and RATs, GWED-G builds partnerships with sub-county land committees in order to facilitate program design and implementation. The HRVs and RATs also help educate the community on the link between landlessness and HIV vulnerability. This partnership building, led by on-the-ground personnel, allows GWED-G to ultimately create livelihood opportunities for landless women groups, including those that have members living with HIV.

Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes
Securing land agreements in northern Uganda has been challenging for women in these communities. Women in these environs continue to be placed in vulnerable positions as security is often tied to land. Therefore, GWED-G is compelled to promote rights-based campaigns that aim to educate the general public on the importance of providing women with access to or strengthening their property and inheritance rights.

Additional Information

Program References and Resources
GWED-G has success stories, case studies, and annual reports that detail their programmatic activities that are available upon request. Stories of change include “Miracle Babies Produced as a Result of HIV Prevention in Maternal Health Services, Amuru District, Northern Uganda,” “A HIV-Positive Woman Overcomes Stigma,” and “Men as Partners of Change.”

Contact Information

Website
http://www.gwedg.org

Address
Plot No. 2/3 Opok Oyaru Road
Pece Division—Gulu Municipality
PO Box 1257, Gulu, Uganda

Phone
+256-414531186 or +256-772644729

Email
Pamela Angwech: Email: gwed-g-uganda@hotmail.com
International Justice Mission (IJM) Uganda

**Background**

**Location**
IJM’s office is located in Kampala, Uganda with their geographic coverage area of work extending to Mukono district. There are two counties in Mukono District. IJM focuses in one of these two counties, Mukono County, and in nine sub-counties within Mukono County. IJM will launch a satellite office in Gulu, Uganda in July 2012 to provide services to vulnerable populations in the Amuru district as well.

**Organizational/Program Goals**
IJM is a human rights agency that brings rescue to victims of slavery, sexual exploitation, property grabbing, and other forms of violent oppression.

**Target Audiences**
- The intended beneficiaries of direct legal intervention and aftercare are the victims of property grabbing including widows.
- The beneficiaries of legal education programs include local council leaders, religious leaders, and community members
- The primary beneficiaries of technical capacity-building trainings include police, local council leaders, court magistrates and staff, lands registry officials, and administrator general staff. Secondary beneficiaries include all users and potential users of these institutions.

**Primary Approaches**
IJM’s primary approaches are legal aid, legal education, public advocacy, awareness raising, legal reform, policy work, titling/registration, and victim aftercare (e.g., provision of physical and emotional support before, during, and after legal intervention.)

**Program Description**
IJM opened an office in Uganda in 2002. Initially IJM Uganda worked in several areas pushing individual cases of abuse through the justice system, but they realized they weren’t developing expertise and decided that in order to have an impact, they needed to focus on one area of justice seeking and one geographical area. Thus, in 2008 IJM Uganda began focusing solely on property grabbing cases in Mukono district in the central region of Uganda, which has a high incidence of property grabbing (and a high crime rate in general).

IJM focuses on providing direct services to vulnerable populations in Mukono in order to prevent property grabbing from widows and orphans and defend victims of this crime. Project activities include legal education, case investigation, direct legal intervention, and aftercare. IJM investigators, lawyers, and aftercare professionals assist victims of property grabbing by investigating claims of abuse, mediating family conflicts, securing legal documentation of land ownership, and ensuring that public justice systems (e.g., police, courts, and laws) effectively protect the poor. IJM runs approximately 15 full-day legal education sessions a year in various communities in Mukono. These legal workshops explain complex land and succession laws, introduce easy safeguards like will-writing and marriage formalization, answer questions about the intersection of cultural beliefs and the law, and connect property grabbing victims to IJM lawyers by conducting case intake sessions. The aftercare team assists victims of property grabbing in pursuing their legal cases by providing physical and emotional support before, during, and after legal intervention.
In addition to direct services, in 2012 IJM began a capacity building project, Project Empaanyi, aimed at ensuring the public justice system in Mukono district provides reliable and effective interventions on behalf of vulnerable widows and orphans in cases of estate administration, land-related civil disputes, and land-related criminal prosecution. At the time of writing this compendium, IJM planned to replicate this program in Amuru district.

Activities

Direct Legal Intervention
IJM attorneys and investigators advocate for victims of property grabbing by investigating claims of abuse, coordinating with police on suspect arrests, navigating complex government and land offices on behalf of clients, and securing legal documentation of land ownership. Primary clients are widows, orphans, and dependents residing in Mukono district, whose cases are referred to IJM from a number of sources. These sources include IJM’s legal education programs, police, local council leaders, partner organizations, and word of mouth. Since 2008, IJM has helped restore 529 people to their homes and land.

Victim Aftercare
IJM’s aftercare team assists victims of property grabbing in pursuing their legal cases by providing physical and emotional support before, during, and after legal intervention. Clients in need are provided with food, medical and psychosocial support, and are connected to partner organizations for school sponsorship or income-generating programs that promote financial security and independence. Every client becomes a beneficiary of IJM’s aftercare services unless they prefer to opt out. Clients remain connected to IJM’s aftercare program for at least six months after their legal case is completed to ensure that their recovery is sustainable.

Given that IJM’s primary clients are widows and orphans, the root of the case usually starts with a death, which precipitates illegal property seizure. A significant percentage of these deaths are HIV-related. IJM’s aftercare team estimates that, as of February 2012, roughly one third of the widows whom IJM actively represents are living with HIV. While IJM’s legal intervention is not contingent on HIV status, client health and wellness are always considered in the development of each client’s individualized aftercare plan. Aftercare specialists provide information on HIV prevention, care, and treatment for all clients. Specifically, during each client needs assessment, IJM aftercare specialists ask about known HIV status, willingness to test for HIV, and current sexual activity. Aftercare specialists facilitate HIV testing for all willing clients. IJM will keep record of a client’s known HIV status in order to create an individual care plan, but HIV status is kept strictly confidential in all other activities.

Widowed clients can be vulnerable in new sexual relationships, so the IJM aftercare team encourages women to demand their right for safe sex and connects them with organizations providing free condoms or education. Aftercare specialists encourage adherence to treatment plans and protection measures. Clients needing specialized care are referred to hospitals, contract counselors, or other HIV-specific organizations and then supported as they pursue those resources. Where necessary, IJM helps to cover the costs of medical treatment.

Legal Education Programs
IJM’s church and community relations team coordinates regular full-day legal workshops. The purposes of these workshops are to:
- explain complex land and succession laws,
- dispel myths about property rights,
- introduce easy safeguards like will-writing and marriage formalization,
• answer questions about the intersection of cultural beliefs and the law, and
• connect property grabbing victims to IJM attorneys by conducting case intake sessions.

Attendees are also given a detailed handbook outlining property rights and the processes required to protect them. Since 2010, the legal education programs are followed by optional will writing clinics for participants, in which IJM staff assist participants in writing legally enforceable wills. Programs rotate between the sub-counties and villages of Mukono district throughout the year. Beneficiaries are any members of the community who attend the open invitation extended by host churches and community groups.

Since 2007, IJM has led 80 legal education programs and reached approximately 5,905 community members in Mukono district. IJM has also trained 613 local council leaders and 556 religious leaders on their role in protecting victims of property grabbing. Because many families affected by HIV find themselves confronted with property grabbing or other succession-related issues, they are often very likely to seek out these kinds of educational workshops.

**Strengthening the Public Justice System**

As part of a global emphasis on transforming public justice systems so they can better serve and protect the poor, IJM works with authorities in the Ugandan public justice system to increase fair access to legal relief for the vulnerable poor. By addressing individual cases of abuse, IJM seeks to identify and address systemic and widespread failures and weaknesses that impede the poorest Ugandans’ access to justice. Capacity building activities such as conducting training programs for local police and confronting issues of bribery and corruption when witnessed have always been part of IJM’s project in Mukono.

Project Empaanyi, IJM’s structural transformation project, began in January 2012. Project Empaanyi brings together IJM, the Justice Law and Order Sector, the Ministry of Lands, the Mukono police, and other authorities to improve the systems that inhibit justice for victims of property grabbing. Initiatives include:

• assisting the court system in organizing case records and streamlining case dockets,
• training police and local council leaders on succession law and property grabbing crimes,
• assisting the administrator general’s office in increasing accessibility and efficiency in identifying estate administrators,
• educating churches and communities on property law and practical protections, and
• raising awareness of property grabbing issues through local media coverage including national newspapers and radio.

Beneficiaries of these activities include public justice system officials themselves, as well as any residents of Mukono district seeking access to land and succession-related offices or seeking assistance in cases of illegal property grabbing. Project Empaanyi is focused on reducing the crime of property grabbing and thus does not directly incorporate HIV issues in its trainings or reform initiatives. However, due to the overlapping populations of people living with HIV and widows and orphans in Uganda, IJM expects those benefiting from a functioning public justice system will include significant numbers of HIV infected and affected individuals.

**Measurement, Results, and Challenges**

**Measurement Strategies**

IJM maintains case files on every case referred, investigated, and/or accepted. These case files contain extensive data about the progress and achievements of each legal case, as well as the care history and status of all clients. All case achievement and client care data are sex disag-
gregated. The following are examples of critical case progression and achievement statistics:

1. victim relief achieved;
2. accused perpetrator arrested, charged, convicted;
3. needs assessment completed, services provided to client within best practice; and
4. timeframes, and number of clients actively following their treatment/care plans.

Data is collected systematically, from all of IJM’s clients, in ways that allow for comparison. IJM collects both quantitative and qualitative information in the areas of legal and aftercare services. IJM has a comprehensive case intake form and preliminary investigation report that the lawyers and investigators fill out upon receipt of the case. In addition, the aftercare team utilizes an aftercare needs assessment form, an aftercare action plan form, and an aftercare termination plan form. The collection of this data helps to assess if IJM is providing appropriate and effective care in a relatively short amount of time.

IJM also tracks the number of legal trainings held (approximately 15 per year), and collects attendance data at each legal education program. They specifically count the number of religious and civic leaders in attendance. Legal education staff conduct qualitative pre- and post-tests to gauge existing knowledge gaps as well as improvements in knowledge following the training.

IJM’s data is computerized, organized, and stored in a database. Initially IJM’s data collection and storage system was paper based, but they switched over to a computerized case tracking management system (CTMS) in December 2011. All of the legal services and aftercare data for the cases are stored in the database. Staff use the data collection forms discussed above to collect information and the data are entered into a CTMS when staff return from the field. Some staff, such as the investigators, carry portable scanners, so they are able to scan important documents such as land deeds or marriage certificates, and these documents are saved electronically under the clients profile in the CTMS. In the future IJM may purchase handhelds for staff to bring into the field, which would act as ‘mobile CTMS units’.

The CTMS helps with monitoring progress, processes, and efficiency, as IJM collects key pieces of information to improve their programs. IJM adjusts activities and timelines according to lessons learned through its monitoring efforts. Goals and targets are set in the system in terms of victim relief and perpetrator accountability. IJM comes up with the targets by examining their resources and number of staff, and occurrences in previous years. IJM uses the data collected to compare annual targets with actual numbers of clients served, track the number of perpetrators of illegal property grabbing who are convicted, and measure the outreach of legal education programs to local and religious leaders and the general community. This integrated online case tracking management system is readily available to the IJM headquarters at all times.

The CTMS enables IJM to design and run a multitude of reports. IJM reports project progress data and analysis to IJM headquarters in Washington, DC on a monthly basis, and also to key partners in Uganda’s public justice system, NGOs, and local media as appropriate. They share some of the high level statistics with local leaders, such as victim relief data (how many successful cases they have had). They also have put these statistics in communication materials that explain what they have done and future plans to get buy-in from leaders and government officials for future phases of work.

IJM sets annual targets for all project outcomes and tracks achievements throughout the year. Targets for the year 2012 are as follows:

- 170 victims relieved
- 1,200 community members trained at legal education programs
• 11 accused perpetrators of property grabbing are arrested by police with support from IJM; eight accused perpetrators of property grabbing are charged; and five perpetrators are convicted
• 600 Local Council leaders trained on their role in preventing and responding to crimes of property grabbing, including provision of appropriate documentation and best practices for land adjudication
• 90 Police officers trained on their role in preventing and responding to crimes of property grabbing, including best practices for evidence collection and charging

IJM conducted a baseline study in Mukono in early 2008 and plans to conduct follow-up studies in 2012 and 2015 to assess the impact and effectiveness of its model in both Mukono and Amuru. The purpose of these studies is to gauge changes in (i) property grabbing victimization rates, (ii) public understanding of the relevant law, (iii) public attitudes towards property grabbing, and (iii) government responses to property grabbing, in a way that can inform future intervention, education and reform efforts.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

- IJM has found that a strategy of conflict mediation in property grabbing casework leads to more timely, amicable, and sustainable outcomes for clients’ families. Many cases find workable solutions this way, while others are forced to use civil or criminal litigation.
- One reason IJM is able to provide a more comprehensive array of services and reach a large audience is due to its deliberate and deep investment in relationships with local government, NGOs, and communities in the defined project area of Mukono district. IJM has proven itself to be a credible partner in responding to the crime of property grabbing in this area.
- IJM’s collaborative approach to working with public justice officials in its casework strategy also allows IJM to monitor the effectiveness of its training. IJM plans to adjust its activities and timelines according to lessons learned through its monitoring and evaluation efforts, its casework provision, and significant changes to the Ugandan government’s response to property grabbing.
- An important outcome of IJM’s efforts thus far has been the recent implementation of the CTMS system, which allows for monthly monitoring and reporting of activities and challenges. The ability to capture and analyze data in real time has increased IJM’s efficiency in terms of response times to client’s emerging needs through improved internal communication, streamlined investigation, and representation. The CTMS will also help them to alter their activities to better meet the needs of clients. The system has the ability to link individuals, such as perpetrators, to multiple cases. This will enable IJM to track repeat offenders of property grabbing and provide effective safety plans for its clients.
- In July 2012, IJM will launch a satellite office in Amuru district, Uganda. This Gulu-based office, IJM’s first attempt to recreate its Mukono successes, will address the unique property rights issues facing the vulnerable poor in Uganda’s war-torn north.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**

IJM’s aftercare specialists note that they face persistent negative attitudes about HIV in communities. In many cases, IJM clients avoid testing for HIV or adhering to ARVs because of the stigma and discrimination towards people living with HIV. Property grabbing victims living with HIV have unique medical needs, and it’s sometimes more difficult for them endure intense legal cases. These clients generally require more time and resources to assist but are often some of IJM’s strongest spokespersons once their cases reach resolution.

IJM is drawing from its experience in Mukono to begin to tackle structural issues that can improve the public justice system. IJM’s recently launched initiative with local government
partners, Project Empaanyi, aims to ensure more reliable and effective interventions on behalf of vulnerable widows and orphans in cases of estate administration, land-related civil disputes, and criminal prosecution. Project Empaanyi will address lack of knowledge and awareness among local leaders about WPIR by introducing targeted trainings for local leaders and teachers, as well as county, district and federal level officials, police, and other authorities. At the community-level, IJM will more actively involve the faith community in awareness raising efforts and encourage their participation in activities to increase the number of community members with wills and marriage certificates.

Additional Information

Program References and Resources: From IJM’s website:

- Claire’s Story: [http://www.ijm.org/sites/default/files/resources/From-the-Field-Claire.pdf](http://www.ijm.org/sites/default/files/resources/From-the-Field-Claire.pdf)
- The weak against the strong: vulnerable people continue to lose land in Mukono, Daily Monitor, September 2010: [http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/-/688334/1241800/-/bipffiz/-/index.html](http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/-/688334/1241800/-/bipffiz/-/index.html)

Contact Information:

Website
[http://www.ijm.org](http://www.ijm.org)

Phone
+1-703-465-5495

Email
Jesse Rudy: jrudy@ijm.org
Kapchorwa-Bukwo Human Rights Organization (KABHURO)28

**Background**

**Location**
Kapchorwa, Kween, and Bukwo districts in Uganda’s Sebei sub-region.

**Organizational/Program Goals**
KABHURO envisions a society where poor and vulnerable women, men, and children are actively involved and engaged in eliminating social injustices, and where each individual’s human rights are respected and upheld by all.

**Target Audiences**
KABHURO’s target audience includes women including widows, households led by orphans and vulnerable children (particularly girls), individuals with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations including the elderly and the landless, community members and local government representatives.

**Primary Approaches**
KABHURO’s primary approaches are mediation services, community sensitization, dialogue, and training.

**Program Description**
Initially established by paralegals educated in both human rights and property rights, KABHURO promotes community-based mediation using alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, trains community representatives in alternate dispute resolution, and convenes community members to engage in dialogue, all with the goal of enabling and empowering community members to defend their human rights. These paralegals have trained local government authorities to utilize gender-sensitive approaches in alternative dispute resolution, in particular those that aid a woman in upholding and defending her property rights, and support the integration of gender into HIV programming.

**Activities**
KABHURO implements a project titled “Securing Women’s Property and Education Rights” (SWOPER) that aims to enhance respect, protection, and upholding of WPIR, and reduce women’s vulnerability to negative cultural practices. This project’s core activities are mediation services, community sensitization, and organization of REFLECT circles, which are discussion spaces where community members identify and provide solutions to pertinent community issues including those that threaten a woman’s property and land rights and her safety. These are described below followed by a fourth activity that is not specific to the SWOPER project.

**Mediation Services**
As part of the SWOPER project, KABHURO provides mediation services to help individuals resolve their issue(s). Approximately 30 paralegals who were trained by The Uganda Association of Women Lawyers in basic human rights are actively engaged in providing mediation in the three target districts. The types of conflicts for which KABHURO’s mediation services have been utilized ranges from land management to domestic violence to child neglect (including

---

28 Effective July 1, 2012, the organization will change its name to Action for Human Rights Organization (AHURO). Its contact information, mailing, and electronic addresses will remain the same.
children who are or whose family members are HIV-positive). Community members learn about these mediation services through KABHURO’s sensitization activities mainly through the radio or paralegal outreach. An individual with a grievance of some type—the complainant—will come to KABHURO’s human rights center/headquarters for assistance. This grievance is registered and KABHURO will then determine if it meets the organization’s mandate and if it does, whether or not it requires mediation. KABHURO will then assign a mediator to collect information from the complainant about the case/incident.

If the case/incident involves a criminal matter or threatens a life, KABHURO will immediately refer this case/incident to the police for additional support. If the case/incident falls within KABHURO’s mission but it is determined that a resolution cannot be reached using KABHURO’s mediation services, the case/incident is then referred to other community decision-making actors such as the clan elders, courts, and the police. Any community member residing in KABHURO’s mediation service area can access this resource; however, this activity primarily targets women, elderly individuals, girl-headed households, and the disabled.

Individuals living with HIV, including women living with HIV, can use mediation to recover grabbed land and also as a means to regain one’s status in the family if the individual’s HIV status has contributed to a partial or complete dissociation, stigmatization, and/or rejection from relatives. Clients served through mediation include mothers living with HIV, according to KABHURO’s 2010 annual report. Women who are threatened with land grabbing and whose land rights have been violated, for example, can also use these mediation services. Over half of the 232 complaints registered at KABHURO in 2011 involved land disputes, and women brought almost 60 percent of these land dispute complaints to KABHURO.

Community Sensitization
KABHURO conducts sensitization activities, targeting the community-at-large through radio talk shows, dramas, and workshops, and the dissemination of information, education, and communication materials. These activities include educating the community about the human rights of individuals living with HIV and AIDS. They also are dedicated to increasing community awareness on WPIR, focusing on the discrimination and stigmatization that women face with respect to access, control, and/or control of property after the death of their spouse, most often from an AIDS-related illness. Topics addressed in the radio shows include land rights with alternate dispute resolution, children and women’s rights, causes and effects of HIV-related stigma and discrimination, and marriage and succession law. These sensitization activities also provide an opportunity for the organization to inform community members about the mediation/conflict services they offer and the location for such services.

REFLECT Circle Initiatives
KABHURO has established six REFLECT circles across the three districts that meet biweekly to discuss various issues of importance; the subject matter of the REFLECT circle changes monthly. KABHURO set up the REFLECT circles, in part, in recognition of the need to discuss pervasive gender norms that promote male superiority and justify gender-based violence and to provide solutions on how to address these norms. Within the REFLECT circle, health and social issues such as HIV and AIDS, sanitation and hygiene, gender-based violence, and human rights are discussed.

The REFLECT circle is a platform through which any community member, including vulnerable members such as persons living with HIV or survivors of gender-based violence, can participate to discuss the issue at hand. During each circle meeting, next steps toward a solution to an issue/problem are identified and “action points” are formalized. Available forms of support
to facilitate action point implementation are noted. These REFLECT circles are sustained by staff and select participants who have been trained in REFLECT methodology. Two of these REFLECT circles have graduated through KABHURO’s growth process to become self-sustaining CBOs complete with their own financial and management structures. KABHURO continues to provide periodic technical assistance to these entities.

Through the REFLECT circles, participants who are living with HIV and AIDS have an opportunity to gain psychosocial support and have access to income generation training and support in the forms of poultry and coffee management.

Training of Local Government Authorities in Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR)

KABHURO paralegals offer targeted dispute resolution training to local government authorities whose units preside over the majority of community conflict cases, particularly those catering to marginalized populations. From 2008 to 2011, KABHURO trained 125 representatives from eight sub-counties in ADR, integrating gender into these trainings. These representatives, representing the Local Council III courts, police, the family and child protection unit, and the community liaison office, were trained in issues that commonly reached ADR including land matters, human rights violations, and HIV-related discrimination.

These authorities, once trained, become a resource for vulnerable populations to use when seeking to resolve a conflict, particularly a land conflict. The majority of those who seek their assistance are widows, women, and PLHIV whose cases often end up in these units because more conventional legal environs may not be as sensitive to the legal needs of these vulnerable populations.

Measurement, Results, and Challenges

Measurement Strategies

At the start of a mediation case, KABHURO collects basic demographic data (e.g., sex, age) from each mediation participant/complainant, using a paper form. On the same form, KABHURO collects case incident data—specifically, respondent(s) name(s), age(s), and sex; witness(es) name(s), age(s), and sex; description of the issue/violation in narrative form; and whether previous assistance was sought for conflict. The paralegal will also record the source(s) of information—for example, community sensitization—through which the complainant came to learn about KABHURO’s services and their thoughts and opinions about the information source(s). (It is at this point that KABHURO informally collects client satisfaction data regarding the community sensitization activity.) For those cases that involve abuse, neglect, and defilement, the paralegals will conduct additional follow-up with law enforcement. The data are sex and age-disaggregated.

Monitoring data for the REFLECT circle is collected on a monthly basis. The topics discussed, the action points that were arrived at the circle’s conclusion, and attendance numbers, which are disaggregated by age and sex, are noted. This status report is compiled at the end of each REFLECT circle using a paper form that is completed by a KABHURO staff member, usually the REFLECT circle coordinator.

For the community sensitization activities, client satisfaction data are collected informally, more or less at registration, when the complainant is asked by KABHURO about how they came to learn about KABHURO. If it was through sensitization, they are asked their thoughts/opinions about those sensitization activities that they attended.
From the paralegals involved in mediation, KABHURO collects the number of cases registered, parties involved, area of case/activity, and the magnitude of the problem.

At the time of writing this compendium, KABHURO planned to begin documenting mediation participants’ experiences through video testimonials.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

It is envisioned that a forthcoming name change to Action for Human Rights Organization (AHURO), effective July 2012, will facilitate the organization’s desire to conduct activities anywhere in Uganda. Most likely, KABHURO will take operations to northeastern Uganda where there are high numbers of land grabbing, especially against women. Its paralegals will continue to support and lead the implementation of these activities in Sebei and in conjunction with community members, sustain the operation of these activities in the region.

The high prevalence of harmful gender norms in the community motivated KABHURO to offer the REFLECT circle activity. The creation of the REFLECT circle has increased the capacity of community members to organize and facilitate discussions—therefore, they take responsibility for the design and execution of this activity and ultimately sustain this forum. It is envisioned that each REFLECT circle will eventually become its own free standing, community owned and operated organization.

The organization does not have a permanent staff position dedicated to M&E. However, as part of the development process for their new strategic plan as AHURO, they will reorient their staffing structure where M&E will be an integral part of the program officer’s role, and thus the organization will have staff dedicated to this effort.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**

The lack of enacted laws that effectively prosecute and punish acts of violence against women has perpetuated male dominance, which is a challenge when trying to promote the importance of seeking justice. Unfortunately, as women gain awareness of their human rights, in some cases they have experienced gender-based violence as a consequence of upholding and defending these rights.

A challenge to addressing human rights is poverty. But when marginalized populations, in particular women and persons living with HIV, are made aware of those rights that enable them to use or own property, these individuals become empowered to engage in sustainable livelihoods and, for people living with HIV, live positively. Concerns around climate change and agricultural development have been raised in REFLECT circles. Subsequent sharing of these discussions with local district authorities led to a commitment to planting trees and providing agricultural inputs for participants.

**Additional Information**

**Program References and Resources**

Contact Information

Address
Plot 37, Sironko-Kapchorwa Highway, opposite of Centenary Bank
PO Box 284, Kapchorwa, Uganda

Phone
+256-782665702 or +256-704906273

Email
Patrick Kitiyo: kabhuro@gmail.com
Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU)

Background

Location
Lango and Teso sub-regions, and those districts occupied by the Acholi people; Kampala. LEMU plans to expand activities to Buganda and Bunyoro Districts.

Organizational/Program Goals
LEMU promotes secure and equitable land rights for vulnerable populations including women and children residing in eastern and northern Uganda. Together with these populations, their communities, and across a wide swath of stakeholders, LEMU works to support state and traditional structures that provide safe and fair spaces for these populations to hold, protect, defend, and demand equitable land rights.

Target Audiences
The main targets of LEMU’s programming are institutions and duty bearers mandated to protect human and property rights (e.g., clans, police, courts, and community-based organizations). Vulnerable women, men, young people, and people living with HIV are also among LEMU’s target audiences.

Primary Approaches
LEMU’s primary approaches are research and documentation, campaigns, networking, and capacity building.

Program Description
LEMU works to secure land rights for vulnerable populations in the eastern and northern regions of Uganda in lands predominantly occupied by the Lango, Acholi, Kumam and Iteso people. LEMU supports state and traditional land management structures that aim to engage all members of society in land and property management, and land rights protection. LEMU conducts rights-based education, builds the capacity of decision making authorities on enforcement of land laws, and advocates for the creation of gender-sensitive land legislation. LEMU’s starting point for activities is on customary tenure systems, in particular the gendered constraints women face when their management of land and land rights are limited. LEMU promotes boundary initiatives as a mechanism for reducing land conflict and builds the capacity of law enforcement to interpret customary tenure law, with attention paid to addressing WPIR violations. LEMU has documented customary tenure laws by sub-region, ensuring that women’s rights are recognized, and published briefs on women’s vulnerability as it relates to land and the impact of HIV on WPIR.

Activities

Promoting an Understanding of Land Rights
LEMU works with traditional institutions to carry out research to understand and document customary land laws. Using the information gained from research, LEMU has published 17 policy briefs and seven information leaflets outlining policy and land rights abuse issues. Most of these abuses are committed against vulnerable populations, for example women. LEMU has worked with the Langi, Iteso, and Acholi people to clarify and document their customary land laws and management responsibilities to challenge customary tenure practices that limit women’s ability to own land.
WPIR in a customary tenure system are challenged by a multitude of factors including lack of clarity of land rights amongst multiple tenure systems, lack of documentation/evidence of land rights, and the common practice of land being inherited through the male, by which a woman can access land. These factors are further compounded by a woman’s biological and social vulnerability to HIV. These are discussed extensively in LEMU’s policy brief titled “Mainstreaming Gender and HIV into the Draft National Land Policy.”

Protecting Land Rights of Vulnerable People
LEMU’s “protective” activities include campaigns for planting boundary trees and drawing maps, which are designed to reduce land grabbing; organizing experience sharing with other local organizations engaged in similar activities of land rights promotion in order to learn from one another; mediation for those engaged in land conflicts; and providing direct assistance to help one obtain titles or Certificate of Customary Ownership for their grazing and community land as evidence of their land rights. These activities have been launched in Lango and Teso districts where many people are engaged in land conflicts because of scarce physical evidence of land rights. This scarcity facilitates land grabbing by more powerful people and entities. LEMU also mediates cases for communities in part to take a more active role in highlighting the consequences of land grabbing.

Widows often seek assistance from LEMU for land-related conflicts. Widows are particularly vulnerable to land conflict, and their families and communities often assume that a widow is responsible for her husband’s death, frequently from HIV.

Strengthening the Capacity of Cultural and Land Management and Protection Institutions
LEMU works with traditional and state-based institutions and authorities in land management to ensure that they carry out their mandates and that land management and enforcement of land law are well-coordinated. This activity is being implemented in Lango and Teso districts, and in Kampala. LEMU is building the capacity of traditional institutions by training and reminding these entities about their responsibility to uphold land law and in monitoring the use of customary law. LEMU is also conducting organizational development assessments in order to help these organizations improve their future efforts to support land management. Also, LEMU trains police on interpreting and applying customary tenure and state land laws, in hopes of improving the protection of WPIR.

Bringing About Pro-poor Changes in Land Management Policies, Laws, and Practices
LEMU has intensively advocated for policy change supporting customary land tenure during the writing of the National Land Policy, which as of May 2012 is in its final stage of revision. Further, LEMU has lobbied for the policy not only to focus on asserting land rights but protection of those rights as well. LEMU highlights the differences in land rights of individual women and those women holding land in trust and living within families by writing policy briefs targeting policy level stakeholders and producing information leaflets for community-level lobbying efforts. LEMU also sits on the Ministry of Lands Sector Working Group, which vets government projects for implementation, and on the National Land Policy Working Group.

Measurement, Results, and Challenges

Measurement Strategies
LEMU collects monitoring data across its different activities. For example, for its activity “Promote Understanding of Land Rights,” an annual workshop is held to collect information on the number of principles, practices, rights, and responsibilities (PPRR)—books purchased, borrowed and distributed, the number of land cases heard, how clans and other institutions
used the PPRR books, and feedback on the PPRR content in the documents. The number of PPRR documents that have been purchased, borrowed and distributed is sex disaggregated. This monitoring data is reported to the traditional institutions and donors in line with donor requests, usually semi-annually or annually.

As part of the “Protecting Land Rights of Vulnerable People” activity, LEMU annually documents the number of people who have planted boundary trees (omara trees), the number of individuals who have requested mediation from LEMU and how their case was resolved. In addition, LEMU collects information on the number of people trained and what action points were agreed upon at the conclusion of each capacity building workshop. LEMU keeps records and has a database for all cases of clients who come to LEMU for legal aid. LEMU uses all of this information to analyze the trends in land conflict, looking at conflict resolution patterns sourced in client case reports, meetings with duty bearers and PPRR reviews where tree plantings can serve as an indicator as to how land conflicts have been resolved. This trend analysis helps LEMU to see where they can improve upon their role in this process and also share this information with the respective donor.

LEMU tracks the number of proposals that have been accepted and incorporated into land law drafts and records the number of meetings that they have convened with Ministry of Land staff, as part of their policy reform activities. Every quarter staff write “effectiveness reports” for LEMU’s five objectives. These are kept in hard copies, although some have been computerized. LEMU also has computerized programs and a file-sharing system for monitoring PPRR sales and distribution, mediated case intake, and workshops conducted across their multiple offices. LEMU has an external evaluation of its programming carried out every two to three years.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

Initially, LEMU did not go into development with an assumption that women’s land rights were being abused. LEMU went into this subject matter to learn and carry out an analysis of land rights abuses. With their research findings and gender analysis, it became apparent that the interconnectedness of men’s physical power, a woman’s physical weakness relative to that of a man’s, the need for physical strength to hold onto one’s land rights, the lack of support given to traditional institutions to protect land rights, and the presence of inefficient state structures all have an impact on WPIR. Addressing these issues is critical within LEMU’s core activities and LEMU has responded by producing papers and briefs on topics such as women’s vulnerability in land rights, and has advocated for supporting WPIR within families, protection of land rights, and prevention of conflicts because it is more difficult to claim lost rights.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**

From LEMU’s perspective, the view that customary tenure does not allow women to own land has been repeatedly promoted and has grown to be a challenge in demanding, defending, and enforcing WPIR. LEMU asserts that women and men have the same land rights and responsibilities to hold land in trust on behalf of their family members and that functioning customary systems must uphold these rights and responsibilities. The problem is that due to women’s physical and social vulnerabilities, it is not difficult for a man to abuse women’s land rights. LEMU has worked to document the various principles, practices, rights, and responsibilities that are found in customary tenure systems with the goal of making this information clear and accessible to everyone, and thus, limit the potential for these rights, especially as those that pertain to women, to be violated.

Promotion of WPIR through education and sensitization campaigns is the conventional strategy used in Uganda, but LEMU’s approach focuses on acknowledging the complex social struc-
tures that inhibit the existence of these rights. Most women know their land rights; though they would not formally refer to these as land rights, they recognize that they have suffered an injustice and seek redress. LEMU is training University of Mukono law students on customary law practices and involving them in land mediation with the hope that these trainees will start a debate between the conventional position on WPIR and that of LEMU’s and initiate a paradigm shift in thinking on the nature and roles of customary systems.

Women and children rely on the clans for various forms of social support. As such, they are wary of taking their cases outside the clans and this makes it difficult to know what happens on the ground when a case has been taken up by the appropriate party: Is the subsequent action discriminatory? Did this action reinforce harmful gender norms? To respond to these types of questions, LEMU advocates for harmonization of the traditional and state land justice systems. With women having physical, economic, and other limitations, they need to have their land rights protected by both the traditional and statutory systems.

Additional Information

Program References and Resources
LEMU’s website contains numerous policy briefs, position papers, and documentation of customary laws (known as “principles, practices, rights, and responsibilities” [PPRRs]) that the organization has developed to support WPIR.

Contact Information

Website
http://www.land-in-uganda.org/

Address
Plot 93/95 Bukasa Road
Namuwongo Estate
PO Box 23722
Kampala, Uganda

Phone
+256-772856212 and +256-0414-576818

Email
Judy Adoko: LEMU@uhonline.co.ug or judyadoko@land-in-uganda.org.
Background

Location
Six sub-counties in Jinja district including Walukuba-Masese division, Mafubira sub-county, Mpumudde division, Bwenge sub-county, Budondo sub-county, and Kakira town council.

Organizational/Program Goals
Slum Women’s Initiative for Development (SWID) strives to empower women at the grassroots level to acquire land and construct homes that are habitable, hence ensuring land security and improved linkages to livelihood opportunities.

Target Audiences
Women comprise the core of SWID’s mission and are the primary target audience for most project activities, including advocacy activities around inheritance rights, land acquisition and titling. However, the community at large is the target audience for SWID’s climate change programming which provides community members with tools to effectively mitigate the impact of climate change and increase their resilience to natural disasters.

Primary Approaches
SWID’s primary approaches are legal aid, legal education, public advocacy, awareness raising, legal reform, policy work, and titling.

Program Description
SWID is a Ugandan non-profit organization that aims to educate urban slum residents at risk for eviction on land tenure and shelter rights. SWID seeks to equip slum residences with resources to effectively demand and defend their land rights, ultimately empowering these individuals to actively engage in discourse surrounding their rights. SWID targets vulnerable populations, in particular women and children residing in the Walukuba-Masese division in Jinja district. SWID carries out empowerment campaigns that build and strengthen the capacity of women in the community to obtain land or participate in land-based decision making while raising awareness of WPIR.

SWID also trains community members in risk mapping to identify and subsequently develop solutions for land tenure and climate threats. Women participants are also engaged in income generation activities. Through SWID’s efforts, close to 70 women residing in two sub-divisions have acquired land security rights and many community members, including women living with HIV, have been trained in succession planning and land tenure.

Activities
SWID implements a trio of activities that support organizational efforts to reduce the various community-level barriers that thwart one’s ability to obtain land tenure, secure shelter and access basic services. SWID intentionally educates women, including women living with HIV, to acquire the necessary skills to advocate for property and/or land ownership and access to services that enable them to meet their basic needs, including health. SWID conducts activities in Jinja district, which has one of the highest HIV prevalence rates in Uganda. It was in the context of implementing this rights-based education that SWID realized that some of the women facing eviction who participated in the property and inheritance rights advocacy activities were HIV-positive.
Advocacy for Women’s Property and Inheritance Rights

SWID convenes duty bearers, local opinion leaders, and grassroots women to engage in local to local dialogue on community issues in the six sub-counties where SWID conducts activities. These forums, which are initiated and conducted by grassroots women trained by SWID, also serve as advocacy platforms where these women are able to bring issues such as land reform, ownership, and inheritance to the attention of these stakeholders. During local to local dialogues, the issues discussed and subsequent solutions identified are noted in a public record, which helps hold the duty bearers and opinion leaders accountable for carrying out these commitments. As part of this activity, grassroots women are empowered to consult with lawyers, paralegals, human rights activists, and the police to learn about how to access and interpret the national constitution and statutory inheritance and land ownership laws, and ultimately engage in decision making processes related to land ownership. The six sub-counties were chosen as implementation sites due to high levels of land grabbing and widespread marginalization faced by people living with HIV residing in these communities.

One of SWID’s main activities is to train paralegals, who in turn educate grassroots women in succession planning, including will writing and in documenting life events or circumstances that can influence their ability to access or own property and land. These individuals trained in will writing assist others living with or affected by HIV and their family members in documenting the process by which goods or land are to be inherited and transferred. The availability of succession planners is publicized through organized community dialogues and radio shows and it is through these channels that individuals living with HIV can access this resource.

Within the scope of this activity, SWID launched the Empowerment of Women living with HIV on Property and Inheritance Rights (EWPIR) project, which aimed to improve the quality of life for slum residents in five sub-counties in Jinja district by empowering these individuals to define and meet their needs in social and political spheres. This project was designed to build the capacity of grassroots women living with HIV to take an active role in decision making and political processes that in turn impact their access, use, and control of property and land. This was an eight-month project, taking place from July 2011 to February 2012.

Education Campaigns to Support Decision-Making on the Sales and Acquisition of Land

SWID launched educational campaigns in 2008 in Walukuba-Masese division and Mafubira sub-county through which 550 women participants received information in the form of handouts. These handouts outlined the steps to obtain a land title and other information to help women actively make decisions concerning land sales and the acquisition of land titles. Local officials including District Land Board and Area Land Committee representatives facilitated the process of translating the materials. Women in these two areas were targeted because many were at risk for or had been victims of eviction. Risk of eviction increases exponentially when a woman is HIV positive and a household head or family member dies.

As a result of this activity, more women have expressed a desire to individually own their land. Since this activity began, 68 of the 550 women have acquired land tenure security and now possess legal documentation to demonstrate land ownership (including joint husband and wife ownership), thus preventing attempts at land grabbing and eviction. An increased number of land transactions and greater participation in land decision-making among the 68 women, including those living with HIV, have also resulted from these project activities.

Risk Mapping to Protect Communities against Climate Change and National Disaster Preparedness

SWID has trained 50 community members from six sub-counties in Jinja district on the use of risk mapping to identify vulnerabilities that may augment the effects of climate change and
natural disasters on their homes and communities. Through these trainings, community members are armed with the tools to actively plan and implement interventions that can respond to and address their complex needs. The tools generated from these trainings further enhance the community’s ability to design interventions that can address the barriers and challenges they face. Women living with HIV who have undergone this training and are at risk of losing their property rights are better equipped to identify environmental vulnerabilities (e.g. floods) that can further impact their wellbeing. They’re also better equipped to participate in community processes that plan and improve services to mitigate the social and economic impacts of HIV. Outcomes of community risk mapping activities have included higher farming yields as a result of collective farming.

**Measurement, Results, and Challenges**

**Measurement Strategies**

SWID collects quantitative and qualitative information from each participant (including opinion leaders and duty bearers) at the start of their involvement with SWID. As part of the survey, demographic data (e.g. sex and age) are collected. The qualitative data is obtained from focus group discussions, whose topics are determined by SWID staff. The same data are collected when participation in a project activity ends. At midline, monitoring data are collected by a M&E officer who uses data collection tools designed by SWID staff. Data are collected initially using paper forms, which are securely stored. The data are then entered into an excel spreadsheet by trained program staff. All data are shared with SWID staff for program improvement purposes. SWID reports these findings to donors either in the form of interim and/or final reports.

For the eight month project (Empowerment of Women Living with HIV on Property and Inheritance Rights Project) information on human rights was collected at baseline, midline, and endline from community members, duty bearers, and opinion leaders in the project sites. Likewise, for the education campaign project, land transaction data were collected, specifically on the number of grassroots women that acquired land since enrollment into the program, those that started construction on the acquired land, and how funds acquired through the housing program were spent. For the community risk mapping project, information on the number and types of mapping activities conducted, in addition to the risks and vulnerabilities identified, are collected. This information is used in evaluating the program’s impact at the community level.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

SWID started as a grassroots organization empowering local slum residents residing in the Walukuba-Masese division of Jinja district to campaign against unlawful evictions and advocate for an improved quality of life. SWID attempts to enlighten, support, and empower those who work on WPIR. Since its inception, SWID had trained approximately 250 community women in five sub-counties in Jinja district in land tenure issues, and close to 60 women have successfully obtained land tenure.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**

- The demand for direct services that go beyond helping an individual meet their basic needs is a constant source of tension for SWID program staff, as they lack the time and resources to do so in an effective and sustainable manner. If more human and financial resources were available, SWID would like to scale up advocacy project activities.
- SWID is aware that there are many residents in their service areas living with HIV who may be facing stigma and discrimination and suffering from self-esteem issues but SWID is unable to help all of those in need due to funding and staffing constraints.
• A high demand for trainings exists, as numerous residents from sub-counties outside of SWID’s coverage area expressed interest in participating in the trainings. In response, SWID increased the number of trainings offered and translated program materials into additional languages for use with additional tribal groups that reside outside of SWID’s coverage area.

Additional Information

Program References and Resources
• Slum Women’s Initiative for Development (SWID) website: https://sites.google.com/site/swiduganda/
• Uganda Community Women’s Group Reap Big from UN Fund: http://ugandaradionetwork.com/a/story.php?s=32250&PHPSESSID=d6a4df129ca5b2bcaef3c8fd0d09b899
• UN WOMEN Investing in Grassroots Women Fighting Land Grabbing and Asset Stripping in Africa: http://www.huairou.org/node/957
• Women’s Land Link Africa (WLLA). (June 2008). “The Link” (Newsletter Vol. 4.)

Contact Information

Website
https://sites.google.com/site/swiduganda/

Address
Eden Road, Plot 21/23
P. O. Box 602
Jinja, Uganda

Phone
+256-712714177

Email
Joyce Nangobi: swidorg@yahoo.com
Uganda Community Based Association for Child Welfare (UCOBAC)

Background

Location
UCOBAC’s office is located in Kampala. Coverage area is 20 districts in eastern and mid-western Uganda.

Organizational/Program Goals
UCOBAC aims to improve the lives of vulnerable children in Uganda by building the capacity of relevant actors and by engaging in community-based advocacy and networking initiatives.

Target Audiences
Child caretakers (primarily women), children, policymakers, and communities

Primary Approaches
UCOBAC’s primary approaches are service delivery (psychosocial, medical, and nutritional support to women living with HIV), capacity building, advocacy, and networking, through community-based initiatives.

Program Description
Using a community and human rights based approach, UCOBAC builds the capacity of child caretakers and relevant actors, and conducts advocacy and networking activities to promote the welfare of children and women. Improving, promoting, and protecting the rights of women are a primary focus for the organization as women are typically the primary caretakers of children. Through its home-based care program, home-based care workers receive training on WPIR and, in turn, provide specific support to clients in their efforts to secure land ownership and control. UCOBAC also runs the Women’s Land, Housing and Property Rights Project through which paralegals offer assistance to women who are trying to reclaim or uphold their right to access, own, and control land, housing, or property. Through its programs, UCOBAC works to build the capacity of grassroots women’s groups, self-help groups and CBOs to take the lead in inciting change in their communities, thus creating a sustainable community-based support system that enhances the lives of children.

Activities

Women’s Land, Housing and Property Rights Project (WLHPR)
Begun in 2008, WLHPR aims to increase women’s access to and control of land, housing, and property. UCOBAC trains volunteer community paralegals in basic skills related to gender issues, land and property dispute resolution mechanisms, and WPIR. Volunteers are recruited in three subcounties in Mityana district and three subcounties in Mubende district with a specific focus on the rural areas. These geographic regions were chosen for the program because in addition to being areas where UCOBAC has conducted previous activities, a grassroots-led mapping exercise on WPIR determined that these areas display a higher prevalence of women’s property rights violations when compared to others.

After receiving training in Ugandan law on women’s rights, land, marriage, and inheritance, volunteers carry out community sensitization activities to raise awareness of WPIR. Formative
research had shown that violations of WPIR are high in these communities due to deeply embedded discriminatory cultural beliefs and attitudes held by both men and women. Community sensitization activities were designed to engage communities around these issues in a way that can help create change. These community sensitization activities include IEC messaging on customary beliefs and practices, and dialogues with the traditional justice systems/actors where they discuss such issues and the negative effects that these behaviors have on community women, their families, and the community at large. It is expected that these perceptions and practices change over time. Additionally, volunteers support women facing land or property conflicts by providing alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms and/or supporting their engagement with existing justice systems. By March 2011, 90 community paralegals had been trained to provide legal support and ADR, and during a six-month period, 152 community sensitization events were held in Mityana and Mubende districts. Another UCOBAC program that is similar in operation to this one was initially launched in the Kiboga district, where UCOBAC has trained paralegals in two subcounties.

Additionally, WLHPR empowers community-based organizations to promote WPIR through initiatives such as radio campaigns, dialogues between women and local government leaders, sensitization events, and increasing access to justice. UCOBAC conducts community-based research and mapping of issues related to women’s access to and control of land, housing, and property. Surveys conducted by grassroots networks provide data to build the base of evidence and documentation. The surveys also feed into the development of advocacy tools that support women’s property rights and access to justice such as local to local dialogues, which help bring community women and local leaders together in a space where they discuss what support is required from the leaders to address important issues previously identified by the women and within this space, the leaders are held accountable to their commitments.

**Hom-Based Care (HBC) Program**
The HBC program aims to provide services to women living with HIV. UCOBAC trains volunteers in Bugiri District and in slum areas of Kampala city (Kawempe and Rubaga) to provide a package of care to HIV-positive women through home visits. Types of care include psychosocial, material, nutritional, and medical support. Women served through the HBC program have access to grants, credit, and loans from UCOBAC to initiate income-generating activities. Women with complex HIV cases can be referred to nearby health centers for specialized treatment or, depending on their condition, can access treatment at the health center located on the premises of UCOBAC’s headquarters. Each volunteer HBC worker has about seven clients and visits each of them about once a week.

As this program progressed, volunteer HBC workers relayed to UCOBAC that their clients were regularly experiencing housing insecurity and other property rights violations as a result of their HIV status. To address this issue directly, UCOBAC began providing education for those volunteers based in Bugiri and Kampala on WPIR. Now incorporated as a regular part of volunteer trainings, HBC workers based in both Bugiri district and Kampala are able to provide specific support to clients in their efforts to secure land ownership and control. Additionally, UCOBAC provides assistance to clients in obtaining building materials for housing construction.

**Measurement, Results, and Challenges**

**Measurement Strategies**
Quantitative and qualitative data are collected from both programs. All data are age and sex disaggregated.
The WLHPR volunteer paralegals complete detailed paper forms on a monthly basis to report number of clients, client demographic information, types of cases heard, action taken, and the outcome of cases. Information collected on sensitization events includes number of attendees, type of event, location, attendance, information shared, method of sensitization, and community reactions. Additionally, paralegals report information on client consultations, including client demographics, type of case, action taken, and the outcome. The paper forms completed by the paralegals are submitted to UCOBAC staff in Mubende and Mityana. UCOBAC staff then computerizes the data and use it to write monthly and yearly reports to the main office in Kampala. The branch of the program in Kiboga collects forms from volunteers but these data are not computerized because there is no formalized M&E structure in operation there. UCOBAC also collects feedback three times a year from paralegals who participate in their trainings.

The HBC volunteers report information on their clients, issues they are facing and services provided. When a new client joins the program, information is collected on her land access and/or ownership, economic activities and family status. Volunteers record this information on each visit to a client, including the date, type of support provided, current challenges the client is facing, and any outcomes of the meeting. For the HBC program in Rubaga and Kawempe, volunteers report monthly on the number of clients served and outcomes of the support, specifically the client's health and hygiene, status of economic activities such as income generation, and any successes or problems that have occurred since the last visit.

HBC volunteers in Rubaga and Kawempe have organized into home-based care alliances (HBCAs), which mobilize volunteers to advocate for themselves at the local and national levels. The HBCAs report monthly to UCOBAC on progress made in their activities, specifically around recruitment and retention of members (peers), and advocacy efforts on behalf of the alliance. Within the context of the HBCA, volunteers also identify issues related to their HIV and care work that can be strategically addressed.

The HBC volunteers, including the Kawempe HBCA volunteers trained in WPIR, complete paper forms on a monthly basis, which are then submitted to UCOBAC staff. These data are not computerized and the data are reported to the donor, using the donor-mandated templates that request this type of information.

UCOBAC uses the data it collects for various purposes. Data on activities are analyzed to evaluate progress towards goals, identify challenges, devise solutions to improve programs, and provide feedback to communities and support to volunteers. Community paralegals, field officers, and the regional program officer work together to report to district and sub-county departments on a quarterly basis. The program officer and the Executive Director report every six and 12 months, respectively, to donors and partner organizations at the national and international level.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

During a six-month period in 2011, 90 trained paralegals held over 150 community sensitization events on WPIR in two Ugandan districts and provided direct assistance to women in resolving their property issues. As a result of the WLHPR program, there is greater awareness in communities of women’s land, housing, and property rights; increased access by women to legal assistance and justice through trained paralegals; increased capacity of community based organizations to promote WPIR; and the development of research and advocacy tools that support WPIR.
Outcomes of the HBC program include improved health and quality of life for women living with HIV; higher awareness of property rights and an increased capacity to exercise those rights among HIV-positive women; and greater land and economic security among program clients.

UCOBAC has found that community involvement in the design, implementation, and feedback processes across both programs is strong. This has been important to their success.

Working on both WPIR and HIV and AIDS has helped UCOBAC to provide more holistic support to vulnerable populations. Addressing the linkage has helped UCOBAC to be more confident that they are improving their clients’ lives. This feeds directly into the organization’s overall goal of improving the welfare of children through building the capacity of child caretakers.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**
Collecting comprehensive and accurate data from volunteers in an effective way has been a constant learning process. Forms sent to the office from field workers often lack details about cases, limiting UCOBAC’s ability to report on specifics. The current data collection forms inhibit the ability of paralegals to report the challenges they face in their work.

UCOBAC has faced challenges in building sufficient staff capacity to carry out detailed data analysis and relating this back to the organization’s framework and theory of change.

Securing funding to work at the intersection of WPIR and HIV/AIDS is another challenge. UCOBAC has found it difficult to convince donors that a linkage exists between the two and that it is important to work on both concurrently. This has limited the extent to which UCOBAC has been able to mainstream both in their programs.

UCOBAC has faced challenges in training volunteer HBC workers fully on WPIR and HIV/AIDS simultaneously. Both are huge issues on their own in terms of content and services. UCOBAC has found it difficult to ensure that volunteers have the capacity to support clients effectively in both areas. In addition there have been challenges with burnout among HBC volunteers due to the addition of property rights training on top of the volunteer’s existing workload.

**Additional Information**

**Program References and Resources**

**Contact Information**

*Address*
PO Box 7449
Kampala, Uganda

*Phone*
+25641222926 or +256772926214

*Email*
Frances Birungi: ucobac@utlonline.co.ug
Uganda Network on Law, Ethics and HIV/AIDS (UGANET)

**Background**

**Location**
Masindi, Lira, Pallisa and Ntungamo Districts and Kampala

**Organizational/Program Goals**
UGANET aims to promote the human rights of persons living with HIV and AIDS (PLHIV) and further an understanding of HIV-related vulnerabilities.

**Target Audiences**
Persons living with or affected by HIV and AIDS, including:
- women living with HIV and AIDS
- survivors of gender-based violence
- widows
- orphans
- refugees and internally displaced persons

Overall, women and girls are the primary beneficiaries because of their greater socioeconomic and health vulnerabilities compared to men.

**Primary Approaches**
UGANET’s primary approaches are education, dialogue, training, legal services, media, and community-based advocacy and activism

**Program Description**
UGANET’s community-based programs use empowerment and legal education and protection to reduce vulnerability to HIV and the social impacts of HIV and AIDS. UGANET integrates human rights, including property rights and inheritance rights, into HIV interventions to foster an enabling environment and to directly support persons affected by HIV and AIDS to claim their property and inheritance rights. UGANET uses networks of persons living with HIV and AIDS and antiretroviral therapy (ART) clinics as venues for legal aid and education activities.

**Activities**

*Engage Duty-Bearers in Dialogue*
UGANET works with Local Council leaders, traditional chiefs and clan leaders, and the Parliament of Uganda to ensure that statutory laws and customary practices promote and protect WPIR in the context of HIV and AIDS. Engaging these duty bearers in dialogue takes place in Masindi, Lira, Pallisa, and Ntungamo Districts, which were chosen based on one or more characteristics associated with HIV prevalence and vulnerability, including being a post-conflict setting (where land recovery is difficult, especially for widows), having a high rate of gender-based violence, and being near truck routes.

*Empowerment of Women and Girls*
UGANET conducts workshops to train women and girls on their property and inheritance rights, including what statutory laws say about women's right to own property, what makes a marriage legal, and how having a legal marriage can protect a woman's property rights. The workshops take place in Masindi, Lira, Pallisa, and Ntungamo Districts. UGANET’s work-
shops focus on women and girls because they are disproportionately at risk for losing land, housing, and other assets when a partner or parent dies.

**Legal Aid Program**
UGANET’s Legal Aid program provides free legal services in Masindi, Lira, Pallisa, and Ntungamo Districts. Legal aid services are open to all who seek them. Each district has a lawyer who holds regular legal aid clinics for walk-in clients, including in ART clinics. Each district also has approximately 10 trained community rights workers who conduct community outreach and may refer cases to UGANET’s district lawyer. The community rights workers are trained in land law, how customary practices relate to land law, and how to assess problems around land inheritance. Commonly encountered and often entangled cases include land disputes, denial of inheritance, child abuse and neglect, and domestic violence. Lawyers and community rights workers hold sensitization sessions in the community and at health clinics to create awareness about HIV, human rights, and the law.

**Community Sensitization**
Community sensitization activities include community meetings and radio programs to disseminate information on human rights, including women’s property rights during and after marriage. The activities take place in Masindi, Lira, Pallisa, and Ntungamo Districts. UGANET’s discussions of human rights during these community meetings and radio programs address both the rights of PLHIV and WPIR.

**Advocacy and Activism**
UGANET is engaged in national legislation, policy, and advocacy efforts, including reviewing and reforming legislation on HIV and AIDS as well as marriage, divorce, and domestic violence, which affect all Ugandans’ human rights, but are especially relevant for women living with or affected by HIV and AIDS.

As part of these efforts, advocacy tools have been developed that showcase the contribution of legal aid in enforcing women’s property rights, and these include a book and a film that presents a collection of stories of women whose lives have been enhanced through UGANET’s activities.

Since 2011, with additional funding from UN Women, UGANET is intensifying and expanding its activities in Masindi and Lira Districts under their Holistic Empowerment and Activism Project on Women’s Property Rights (HEAL). Under this activity, UGANET is adhering to performance monitoring criteria given to them by UN Women, and at the present they are collecting M&E data on knowledge and attitudinal changes around HIV, AIDS, and property rights.

**Measurement, Results, and Challenges**

**Measurement Strategies**
UGANET has collected baseline data for a performance monitoring evaluation to assess the progress and outcomes of their programming in Masindi and Lira Districts on knowledge and attitudes around HIV and AIDS, and property rights (under the HEAL project). The baseline data were collected through key informant interviews with local leaders, focus group discussions with women and men—some of whom are living with or affected by HIV and AIDS, and individual interviews with community members. Some of the outcome indicators collected include: the number of duty bearers at national and/or local levels who have been provided with relevant information on the need to protect WPIR in the context of HIV and
AIDS; the number of legal frameworks and processes that have been (or are in the process of being) developed or amended to better promote and protect WPIR; and change in the number of documented cases of women living with or affected by HIV and AIDS in targeted communities who were able to successfully assert their property and inheritance rights. Endline data collection is planned. Baseline and endline key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and individual survey interviews will assess changes in these outcomes for a final project report to the donor, UN Women.

UGANET regularly records case information of legal aid clients on a dedicated form, and community rights workers report on their legal aid and education activities each month. UGANET also documents each sensitization event and training held, collecting data on attendees (name, gender, age, and organization of participants) and changes in their knowledge and satisfaction with the training through pre- and post-questionnaires. The client case data and sensitization event/training data are collected using paper forms and are kept in district offices and the main office.

Community rights workers report monthly to legal officers in their district. Legal officers report on activities to the UGANET Secretariat, which then uses the information for preparing reports to share with donors and creating relevant advocacy tools (booklets, videos, etc.). These advocacy tools are also shared with the communities and in particular with local leaders, highlighting the project’s various achievements.

UGANET is also using the stories of individual women and girls to develop a framework of HIV-related vulnerability.

Key Findings and Lessons
The main types of cases brought by legal aid clients are land disputes, denial of inheritance, child abuse and neglect, and domestic violence arising from land conflicts. Communities view women as land users but not owners. This may affect women’s decisions to seek help from local leaders about land disputes—nearly half (48 percent) of women respondents from the HEAL baseline data collection did not trust leaders to relate to their situation of being dispossessed of their husband’s property.

Duty bearers are concerned about the ambiguity of laws, the parallel system of statutory and customary laws, and how succession laws (statutory and customary) should be implemented. They are also apprehensive about availing strong support for women’s economic rights, which may lead to disharmony in families and communities. Yet they appreciate being part of repeated, open dialogues and discussions about the laws and other issues.

Men and boys need to be included in efforts to raise awareness of the need for WPIR. Clan and customary authorities also need to be engaged in sensitization processes.

Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes
The main challenge has been confronting customary norms and practices that discriminate against women and girls, especially in owning property, and that view women as property. This has been especially challenging in interactions with duty bearers. UGANET’s efforts to make the case for women’s property ownership have created some resistance to the evidence being generated and shared by UGANET. UGANET has been persistent and is working to adopt approaches, such as holding debates in clan meetings, which are friendlier to customary positions. Transport for community rights workers has been challenging. Rights workers often travel long distances, which is costly in both money and time for these volunteers.
Additional Information

Program References and Resources
From UGANET, the following materials can be, or soon will be, accessible via UGANET’s website (http://www.uganet.org) or office.

Informational and advocacy booklets on:
• HIV/AIDS and human rights
• HIV/AIDS and children’s rights
• HIV/AIDS in the workplace

Human rights and HIV/AIDS manuals and reference guides for:
• Judicial officers
• Police and uniform officers
• Programme officers

Book on success stories of women upholding and defending their property rights.

Contact Information

Website
http://www.uganet.org

Address
Plot 194, Old Kira Road Ntinda
P. O. Box 70269,
Kampala, Uganda

Phone
+256-774199374 or +256-772426321

Email
Dora Kiconco Musinguzi: kicdor@uganet.org or kicdor@yahoo.com
Uganda Land Alliance (ULA)

Background

Location
ULA has an office in Kampala and works primarily in seven districts—Pader, Apac, Ntungamo, Mukono, Mbale, Kibaale, and Luwero District.

Organizational/Program Goals
ULA’s mission is to enhance access, control, and ownership of land by poor and marginalized women, men, and children through the promotion of fair laws and policies aimed at protecting their land rights. ULA strives to create an enabling environment in which women and other vulnerable populations are able to exercise their property rights. Specific objectives include increasing awareness of land rights and achieving fair land laws and policies to protect the rights of vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Target Audiences
The target audiences for ULS include women, men, and their communities as well as magistrates, judges, and traditional and religious leaders.

Primary Approaches
ULA’s primary approaches are capacity building, networking, knowledge management, and legal empowerment.

Program Description
ULA is a membership-based consortium of 60 national, regional, and international civil society organizations and individuals, lobbying and advocating for fair land laws and policies that address the land rights of the poor, disadvantaged, and vulnerable in Uganda. Established in 1995, ULA has three categories of programming: 1) Capacity Building and Membership which includes building the capacity of ULA staff and member organizations, coordinating district land alliances and networking at the regional, national, and international levels; 2) Knowledge Management which encompasses research and M&E in addition to communication and documentation of findings; and 3) Legal Empowerment of the Poor through legal education and paralegal services, law and policy review, and land rights information.

Activities

Women’s Property Rights Program (WPRP)
WPRP was the result of research conducted by government and non-governmental organizations, including ULA, which demonstrated the continued violation of WPIR due to a lack of awareness of relevant laws and policies. In this program, ULA seeks to mobilize a cadre of community women to help address WPIR issues. ULA has recruited and trained 250 women to become advocates for WPIR across six districts—Pader, Apac, Ntungamo, Mukono, Mbale and Kibaale—with a minimum of 40 women advocates in each district. These districts were chosen based on research that demonstrated they have both a high rate of women’s land rights violations as well as high HIV prevalence.

Trainings are held twice a year for five days. During this time, women advocates are educated on laws and policies related to WPIR. The women advocates then act as mentors, passing on their knowledge to other women in their lives. Advocates do this formally by holding lectures or
question and answer style meetings, as well as informally in their daily interactions. ULA holds additional trainings on WPIR for judges, magistrates, and traditional and religious leaders.

Broader education and advocacy is conducted through radio programs, a media campaign using bulk SMS, and continued research. Specific topics ULA is researching include: women in agribusiness; a comprehensive review of land laws through a gender lens; evaluating the performance of institutions, both formal and informal, in delivering services to women; the resettlement of female ex-combatants in Gulu; women's land accessibility in Pader and Amuru Districts; land tenure and livelihood issues in the oil rich Albertine Graben region; and land grabbing in Karamoja region.

Recently, information on HIV and AIDS has been added as a component to this program. Trainings now incorporate education on the property-rights vulnerabilities of those living with and affected by HIV and AIDS. In the future, ULA hopes to expand this work to provide guidance and counseling for people affected by HIV and AIDS across the five districts, as well as to hold voluntary counseling and testing (VCT) testing events.

**Paralegal Project**
The Paralegal Project, based in Luwero District, focuses on educating paralegals and communities about WPIR as well as improving women's access to legal services. ULA provides 40 community paralegals with a five-day training workshop twice a year, during which they are educated about WPIR, alternative dispute resolution, and mobilization techniques. The paralegals then hold educational events within their communities to pass on the knowledge to others. Additionally, paralegals provide assistance with specific property rights cases. They handle cases directly as well as refer individuals to other agencies when necessary.

**Measurement, Results, and Challenges**

**Measurement Strategies**
ULA collects both qualitative and quantitative information about how women, men, youth, and the elderly access and control land. Qualitative data are in the form of testimonials from community members on land ownership issues and conflicts, and quantitative data are collected on the number and type of land conflicts handled in a particular period, number of registered owners, and number of participants in a particular project. The data are collected on a quarterly basis. All data are sex-disaggregated.

ULA collects basic information from WPRP women advocates regarding their mentoring meetings. The data are recorded on paper forms and include the names of mentoring meeting participants, dates of the meetings and the topic of discussion. The data are then entered into an Excel database. Paralegals use paper forms to report information to ULA about their education events (date, topic, attendance, how participants were mobilized to attend, etc.) and their client visits (demographics of clients, type of case, action taken, and result). These forms are submitted to ULA staff each month who enter the data into an Excel database.

ULA conducts key informant interviews with district officials, most often with the community development officer and land officer, and representatives of civil society to understand how HIV and AIDS are affecting women. Data are reported quarterly to the districts, the Ministry of Lands, NGOs involved in human rights work, and program beneficiaries. In the district, reports are made to the relevant departments including that of the chief administrative officer, the natural resource management department under which the district land office sits, and the district community development office.
**Key Findings and Lessons**

Through WPRP, over 200 women are raising awareness and sharing information about WPIR, and HIV and AIDS. ULA recently doubled the size of its Paralegal Program—from 20 paralegals to 40 paralegals. As a result, ULA has achieved the following results:

- Increased awareness of WPIR and the issues surrounding them.
- Improved knowledge of WPIR among judges, magistrates, NGOs, men, women, and entire communities.
- Knowledgeable and skilled volunteers who are able to promote WPIR within their communities.
- Improved access of women to legal services.
- Greater sensitization of communities and formal and informal institutions to WPIR.

Both programs rely heavily on volunteers. This practice allows for strong community involvement but also creates the potential for high staff turnover. Some paralegals find it difficult to continue participation without reimbursement while others are occupied with other activities and eventually drop out of the program.

**Challenges and Unforeseen Outcomes**

ULA has found that mobilizing women affected by HIV is a challenge as there are many barriers to disclosure. In addition, negative attitudes and beliefs of both women and men about WPIR can be difficult to change and traditional cultural practices that prevent women from exercising their rights are still prevalent in many areas.

**Additional Information**

**Program References and Resources**

Materials are available for the scale-up and replication of both programs. ULA has also produced facts on land and property rights: [http://ulaug.org/fact-sheets/](http://ulaug.org/fact-sheets/)

**Contact Information**

*Website*

[http://www.ulaug.org](http://www.ulaug.org)

*Address*

Plot 1521, Block 29, Mawanda Road

P.O. Box 26990

Kampala, Uganda

*Phone*

+256-414540048

*Email*

Esther Obaikol: eobaikol@ulaug.org


### Table 1: Programmatic Activities Conducted and Gender Strategies Addressed by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROOTS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELIN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWAP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMUG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHURO</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWID</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOBAC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGANET</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TYPE OF PROPERTY RIGHTS ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PROPERTY RIGHTS ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Advocacy/Awareness Raising</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Reform/Policy Work</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titling/Registration</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support for Housing/Temporary Shelter</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TYPE OF HIV ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF HIV ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Reform/Policy Work</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Awareness raising</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENDER STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER STRATEGIES</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customary Norms &amp; Practices</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising Awareness of Women’s Rights</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Participation in Communities/Public Life</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Protection/Access to Justice for Women</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Access to Income/Productive Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Gender Based Violence</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Male Norms &amp; Behaviors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 Material and emotional support to women victims of land grabbing (landless women support groups)
30 Material and emotional support to victims of land grabbing, monitoring of the justice system, boundary mapping
31 Boundary tree planting and mapping
32 Succession planning with PLHIV
Table 2: Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity, Institutional Use of Data and Data Collection Activities by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROOTS</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELIN</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWAP</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWED-G</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMM</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHURU</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMU</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWID</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOBAC</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGANET</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional M&E capacity**
- M&E officer on staff
- Regular reporting of data
- Standardized forms or questionnaires used
- Data is sex disaggregated
- Some data are computerized
- All data are computerized

**Institutional use of data**
- Donor reporting
- Program design
- Program improvement
- Advocacy
- Shared with stakeholders (include government authorities, NGOs, partners)

**Data collection**
- Routine process monitoring statistics
- Informal conversations/feedback (anecdotal information)
- Narrative activity reports
- Semi-structured interviews
- Focus group discussions
- Community mapping
- Pre/post training evaluation
- Case studies
- Structured interviews/surveys, without sampling (e.g., exit interviews)
- Structured interviews/surveys, with sampling

Includes key informant interviews and in-depth interviews
### Table 3: Quantitative and Qualitative Data Collected Routinely on Client Demographics, WPIR and HIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demographics of Clientele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Property Rights—Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of land and/or other property conflict</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of engagement duty bearers</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of case</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case monitoring</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of case post organizational intervention (e.g., referred to another source of assistance/solved/closed)</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural factors that impede programming</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success of legal aid cases</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of informal justice system (mediation)</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of formal justice system (courts)</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of organization's own services</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation of land ownership</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant/family member has/had will</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Property Rights—Community Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness of activities</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success outreach activities</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participate in support group</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participate as caregiver/recipient of caregiver services</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenged in accessing health services</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tested for HIV</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✕</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving treatment for HIV</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General health and wellbeing</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of violence</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34 This information is collected via the REFLECT circle monitoring form which is completed by the REFLECT circle facilitator, which in some situations is a AHURO client.

35 IJM is the only organization that systematically asks all clients if they have tested for HIV (they do not ask about or record serostatus, though, unless this information is volunteered). A number of other organizations note whether a client has tested, if the information is volunteered by the client at any point during their case, however they do not routinely or systematically collect this information.
Appendix 2

**Directory of WPIR Organizations and Services**

1. GROOTS: Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood, Kenya
2. KELIN: Kenya Legal and Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDS
3. YWAP: Young Widows Advancement Program, Kenya
4. GWED-G: Gulu Women Empowerment and Globalization, Uganda
5. IJM: International Justice Mission, Uganda
6. AHURO: Action for Human Rights Organization, Uganda
7. LEMU: Land and Equity Movement Uganda
8. SWID: Slum Women’s Initiative for Development, Uganda
9. UCOBAC: Uganda Community Based Association for Child Welfare
10. UGANET: Uganda Network on Law, Ethics and HIV/AIDS
11. ULA: Uganda Land Alliance
**GROOTS**
Grassroots Organizations Operating Together in Sisterhood, Kenya

**Contact Information**
Email: Esther Mwaura, grootsk@grootskenya.org
Phone: +254 27 18977; +254 27 783640
Website: http://www.groots.org/members/kenya.htm

**WPIR Programming**
- Legal education
- Public advocacy/awareness raising
- Research

**HIV/AIDS Programming**
- HIV mitigation

**Gender Strategies Addressed**
- Raising awareness of women’s rights
- Women’s participation in communities and public life
- Legal protection/access to justice for women

---

**KELIN**
Kenya Legal and Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDS

**Contact Information**
Email: Mr. Allan Achesa Maleche, info@kelinkenya.org
Phone: +254 020 251 5790; +254 020 386 1596; +254 717 261 408; +254 020 386 190
Website: http://kelinkenya.org

**WPIR Programming**
- Legal aid
- Legal education
- Public advocacy/awareness raising
- Legal reform/policy work
- Titling/registration

**HIV/AIDS Programming**
- Legal reform/policy work
- HIV mitigation

**Gender Strategies Addressed**
- Customary norms and practices
- Raising awareness of women’s rights
- Legal protection/access to justice for women
- Women’s access to income or productive resources
YWAP Young Widows Advancement Program, Kenya

Contact Information
Email: Esther Angudha, youngwidows@yahoo.com
Phone: +254 721 931 397; +254 020 788 657
Website: currently unavailable

WPIR Programming
- Legal aid
- Legal education
- Public advocacy/awareness raising
- Research

HIV/AIDS Programming
- HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
- Raising awareness of women’s rights
- Women’s participation in communities and public life
- Legal protection/access to justice for women
- Women’s access to income or productive resources

GWED-G Gulu Women Empowerment and Globalization, Uganda

Contact Information
Email: Pamela Angwech, gwed-g-uganda@hotmail.com
Phone: +256 414 531 186/ +256 772 644 729
Website: http://www.preventgbvafrica.org/organizational-member/organizational-member-gulu-women-economic-development-and-globalization-gwed-g

WPIR Programming
- Legal aid
- Legal education
- Public advocacy/awareness raising

HIV/AIDS Programming
- Prevention
- HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
- Raising awareness of women’s rights
- Women’s participation in communities and public life
- Legal protection/access to justice for women
- Reducing gender-based violence and coercion
**Contact Information**

**Email:** Jesse Rudy, jrudy@ijm.org  
**Phone:** +703 465 5495  
**Website:** [http://www.ijm.org](http://www.ijm.org)

**WPIR Programming**

- Legal aid  
- Legal education  
- Public advocacy/awareness raising  
- Legal reform/policy work

**HIV/AIDS Programming**

- Care

**Gender Strategies Addressed**

- Customary norms and practices  
- Raising awareness of women's rights  
- Legal protection/access to justice for women  
- Women's access to income or productive resources

---

**Contact Information**

**Email:** Patrick Kitiyo, kabhuro@gmail.com  
**Phone:** +256 782 665 702; +256 704 906 273

**WPIR Programming**

- Legal aid  
- Legal education  
- Public advocacy/awareness raising  
- Research

**HIV/AIDS Programming**

- HIV mitigation

**Gender Strategies Addressed**

- Customary norms and practices  
- Raising awareness of women's rights  
- Legal protection/access to justice for women  
- Women's access to income or productive resources  
- Reducing gender-based violence and coercion
LEMU Land and Equity Movement Uganda

Contact Information
Email: Judy Adoko, LEMU@utlonline.co.ug
Phone: +256 772 856 212
Website: http://www.land-in-uganda.org

WPIR Programming
- Legal aid
- Legal education
- Public advocacy/awareness raising
- Legal reform/policy work
- Research

HIV/AIDS Programming
- HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
- Customary norms and practices
- Raising awareness of women's rights
- Legal protection/access to justice for women

SWID Slum Women's Initiative for Development, Uganda

Contact Information
Email: Joyce Nangobi, swidorg@yahoo.com
Phone: +256 712 714 177
Website: https://sites.google.com/site/swiduganda/

WPIR Programming
- Legal aid
- Legal education
- Public advocacy/awareness raising
- Legal reform/policy work
- Titling/registration

HIV/AIDS Programming
- Care
- HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
- Raising awareness of women's rights
- Women's participation in communities and public life
- Legal protection/access to justice for women
- Women's access to income or productive resources
UCOBAC Uganda Community Based Association for Child Welfare

UGANET Uganda Network on Law, Ethics and HIV/AIDS

Contact Information
Email: Frances Birungi, ucobac@utlonline.co.ug
Phone: +256 41 222 926; +256 772 926 214

WPIR Programming
• Legal aid
• Legal education
• Public advocacy/awareness raising
• Titling/registration
• Research

HIV/AIDS Programming
• Care
• HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
• Raising awareness of women’s rights
• Women’s participation in communities and public life
• Legal protection/access to justice for women
• Women’s access to income or productive resources

Contact Information
Email: Dora Kiconco Musinguzi, kicdor@uganet.org or kicdor@yahoo.com
Website: http://www.uganet.org

WPIR Programming
• Legal aid
• Legal education
• Public advocacy/awareness raising
• Legal reform/policy work
• Research

HIV/AIDS Programming
• Legal reform/policy work
• HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
• Customary norms and practices
• Raising awareness of women’s rights
• Legal protection/access to justice for women
• Addressing male norms and behaviors
Contact Information
Email: Esther Obaikol, eobaikol@ulaug.org
Phone: +256 414 540 048
Website: http://ulaug.org

WPIR Programming
• Legal aid
• Legal education
• Public advocacy/awareness raising
• Legal reform/policy work
• Research

HIV/AIDS Programming
• HIV mitigation

Gender Strategies Addressed
• Customary norms and practices
• Raising awareness of women's rights