



**Quality Action**  
Improving **HIV** Prevention in Europe

## Quality Action CASE STUDY

### 1. Name and country of the organisation

*(Please state the name and the country of the organisation that implemented this practical application of a QA/QI tool as part of Quality Action. We do not publish this information unless you agree. You can remain anonymous by adjusting the settings at the end of this form).*

Positive Voice - Association of PLHIV in Greece  
Greece

### 2. Authors of the case study and contact details

*(Please provide then name of the author(s) of this case study and any contact names, Email address or websites where readers can access more information about this practical application of a QA/QI tool).*

### 3. External support (facilitators/partners/technical assistance)

*(Please list the names of other organisations and/or people who were involved in this practical application of a QA/QI tool, e.g. project partners, technical assistance, external stakeholders etc..).*

-HCDCP  
-Ath Checkpoint

### 4. Project/Programme and key population/target group addressed

*(Please describe the project/programme to which you applied the tool and the key population/target group addressed).*

Project: Ath Checkpoint

Ath Checkpoint is a non-clinical, community based HIV, HBV and HCV prevention and testing promotion facility operating in Athens, designed for the sexually active population while at the same time targeting also some of the Most At Risk key Populations (MARPs) such as Men who have Sex with Men (MSM). Its purpose is to be operated by and for the community (CBVCT - Community Based Voluntary Counseling and Testing) and it is based on other best practices originating abroad. Ath Checkpoint is operated by Positive Voice.

## 5. Goals/aims of applying the QA/QI tool

*(Please list the goals you wanted to achieve with the practical application of the tool).*

- The core aim is to make a quality assurance assessment and to spot areas where delivery of quality services can be improved
- Applying such a comprehensive tool to a quite complex project can result in a map for better future planning. This map is a good base for internal communication with the managers/BoD
- Having an external evaluation as a standard in the QIP tool, there is an added value to the procedure of doing this tool-based assessment
- Certifying quality offers substantial support to fundraising attempts

## 6. Tool and methodology used

*(Please indicate which of the five tools you used (Succeed, QIP, PQD, PIQA, Schiff) and briefly sketch out the steps and measures of how you applied it).*

Tool: QIP

- The person in charge of the application of the tool received special training through Quality Action at the European level. The tool to be trained in was selected for being the most comprehensive.
- For the application of the tool, a project of a commensurate scope was chosen
- A schedule for the application and a call for forming an implementation team was decided in cooperation with the operating organisation
- The schedule was sometimes rearranged due to workload of all the stakeholders
- Implementation started with a narrowed down implementation team
- The second part of the Quality Action European-level training was helpful in order to redefine the schedule, the level of engagement, feasibility and selection of various components
- Implementation is still ongoing

## 7. Results and benefits of applying the QA/QI tool

*(Please describe what resulted from applying the tool and if and how your project/programme benefitted).*

- The tool application itself was a capacity building exercise. It is a good means to measure capacity to assess your work and the time and resources needed for this assessment
- Application is useful to reflect on details often missing from the everyday problem-solving routine
- Using an external reviewer helps in discovering hidden aspects of the project

## 8. Recommendations

*(Please describe the lessons learnt from positive and negative experiences during the process of using the tool itself and about the quality of projects/programmes like yours).*

- The QIP tool is resource-demanding and thus difficult to implement. It needs good time management and availability.
- The scale of the tool demands an organic integration into the project being assessed
- It is hard to be carried out by one implementer or a very small team
- Involvement of key decision makers and executives from all departments is necessary due to the depth that the tool goes to
- Following the second Quality Action training at the European level, it is useful to introduce some flexibility in the implementation of the tool. For example, only using specific parts of the tool can be negotiated
- An important barrier was the lack of availability from the side of the people that operated the project. Even though a team was appointed, it never operated with all its members
- The tool demanded at least double the time initially allocated. It is also necessary that this time is divided up into follow up meetings because many questions that need investigation arise during the application of the tool.
- The scale of the tool requires some kind of remuneration for the implementation coordinator if she/he is an external consultant

**Please indicate how you want this case study to be published:**

- ☐ *I want this case study to be published mentioning the names of countries, organisations, people and contact details/websites in the text above.*
- ☐ *I want this case study to be published anonymously, meaning that names of countries, organisations, people and contact details/websites in the text above will be removed by the editors before publishing.*
- ☒ *I want this case study to be published without mentioning people's names, meaning that names of people in the text above will be removed by the editors before publishing, but names of organisations and countries as well as website addresses will remain.*

*Please return the filled in document to your country contact  
(who will then forward it to their WP 6 contact).*

**Thank you!**