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Outline

- Why we did it
- How we did it
- What we found
- Was it worth it?
Study Objectives

- Propose indicators for performance of different integrated programs with respect to efficiency
  - assess their practical feasibility
- Quantitative: assess the relative efficiency of different models of integration of HIV and FP services
  - One Stop Shop (OSS)
  - Internal Referral (IR)
- Qualitative: identify potential barriers and facilitators of efficiency improvement

Methodology

- Cross-sectional, non-randomized comparison of the efficiency of two models of integration
  - One Stop Shop (n=3)
  - Internal Referral (n=7)
- Top down costing approach
- Efficiency across models measured using the following:
  - Percent of missed opportunities in ART clinic
  - Provider time per ART patient counseled on FP or provided with an FP method
  - Unit cost per ART patient counseled on FP or provided with an FP method
Data collection

- Mix data sources:
  - 900 Patient record reviews
  - 150 patient exit interviews with time motion component
  - 20 provider interviews
  - HMIS and facility cost data

- Costs include labor, drugs and medical supplies, training and supervision

- Period covered October 2013 - September 2014

Findings: Percent of Missed Opportunities

- Indicator feasibility:
  - 6 sites: no mention of FP in the patient records reviewed
  - 4 sites: inconsistent
  - With current routine data available – not feasible

- Quantitative findings:
  - Patient exit interviews across sites: 8% to 88%
  - No statistically significant difference across models
  - Median of 36% for the OSS model and 50% for the IR model
    (no statistically significant difference, P-value 0.43 with Mann-Whitney U test)
Findings: Provider Time per ART Patient Counseled on FP

- **Indicator feasibility:**
  - Time-motion study required since high level estimation of the number of patients getting FP/LOE not possible

- **Quantitative findings:**
  - Average time per ART visit **without** and **with** FP counseling
    - IR model: 9 and 12 minutes
    - OSS model: 10 and 13 minutes
  - Visits with FP counseling last longer on average than visits without counseling by an average of two minutes (statistically significant difference)

Findings: Unit Cost per ART Patient Receiving FP Services

- **Indicator feasibility:**
  - Main challenge was the availability of data on the number of patients provided with FP services in the ART clinic
  - Collecting and analyzing cost data requires specific technical skills

- **Quantitative findings:**
  - With current level of FP service provision, no statistically significant difference (P-value 0.73) in the average unit cost across models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ART + FP counseling</th>
<th>ART + FP counseling + method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR model sites</td>
<td>$ 260</td>
<td>$ 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSS model sites</td>
<td>$ 258</td>
<td>$ 260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The OSS model is not necessarily more or less efficient than the IR model
Discussion: Unit Cost per ART Patient Receiving FP Services

- Some efficiency gains from the OSS relative to the IR model
- Cumulatively, these “savings” could increase in size as missed opportunities decrease and more patients get FP services
  - BUT the FP clinic will still have to function under the OSS model because there are still HIV- women to serve: “limit” to gains when HIV+ population with FP need not large
- Societal benefit/cost for women getting integrated care is probably more important than the potential savings

Barriers and Facilitators of Integration

**Barriers**

- **Potential staff shortages**: providers noted that staff are overworked
- **Weak referral tracking**: a formal referral tracking system was not always part of the integration design

**Facilitators**

- **Enough upfront orientation and information**: providers identified this as one of the necessary elements for success
- **Adequate integration training**: trained providers stressed the importance of the acquired FP knowledge and willingness to learn
What’s the take home?

- Integration is at the level of the provider
  - The systems might be in place but the providers need to actually offer the services
- Providers need to be sensitized to adequately record services
  - We can’t track/cost what we don’t count
- Design a formal referral system as part of the integration program process
  - We can’t track/cost what we don’t count
- Efficiency gains of one model over another small (limited)
- Limitations
  - Cross-sectional, FP recording issue
  - Tanzania study
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