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From outputs to outcomes

**Output**
- Commodities and services delivered

**Outcome & Goals**
- Women using FP

**Challenge**: difficult to measure outcomes & goals - expensive surveys, experimental studies
Our solution: Impact 2

- Used to estimate wider impacts of family planning services
- Helps service providers, donors & governments to communicate:
  - Demonstrate value for money
  - Compare FP with other health interventions
- Set realistic programme goals
- Monitor progress over time
- Motivate staff
Examples: using Impact 2

Planning:

“Government wants to increase CPR by 50%. We can contribute 10% points”

Monitoring:

“Our market share for modern family planning was 24% in 2011”

Advocacy:

“Our services averted about 370 maternal deaths over the past 5 years”
Overview of Impact 2

- Excel-based
  - Simple to use (Easy & Expert modes)
  - Transparent

- Includes data for all developing countries
  - Limited data entry required
  - Best data from UN, WHO, DHS etc.
How it works

service provision to impact

service/product provision

Estimated users

CPR contribution, market share, maternal deaths averted, etc.

Impact goal to services provision
Family planning services/products provided

- Long acting & Permanent methods
- Short-term methods

Products provided
Units needed per year

Estimated Family Planning Users

- CPR contribution
- Market share

Pregnancies averted

- Miscarriages averted

Births averted

- Carbon footprints averted
- Child deaths averted
  * (Due to improved birth spacing)
- Maternal deaths averted

Abortions averted

- Unsafe abortions averted

DALYs averted
  * (maternal morbidity & mortality, child mortality)

Costs saved to healthcare system
  * (Direct treatment costs: ANC, delivery, PAC, pregnancy and birth complications)
Quick tour of Impact 2

- Can look at trends from 2000 to 2020
- Must enter service provision data – by method, by year
Quick tour of Impact 2

What market share do you want to see?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAPM Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Click yellow cell, click arrow, and pick country from list)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Market Share in 2010

(Lose scroll bar below graph to change year)

Your Share 39.3%

If you wanted to explain this in a report, you might say:

We estimate that in 2010 39.3% of all women using a LAPM received their method from our programme.

2005 < 2010

Limitations: predicting sudden increase in CPR, predicting the introduction of new methods, converting service provision numbers into estimated users. Click for more details.
Quick tour of Impact 2

Pregnancies, Births & Abortions Averted
Annual with pre-baseline provision included

Maternal and Child Deaths Averted
Annual with pre-baseline provision included

- Pregnancies averted
- Births averted
- Abortions averted
- Unsafe abortions averted

- Maternal deaths averted
- PBI infant deaths averted
Quick tour of Impact 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancies averted</td>
<td>69,033</td>
<td>92,277</td>
<td>129,461</td>
<td>174,608</td>
<td>237,389</td>
<td>299,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births averted</td>
<td>40,969</td>
<td>54,764</td>
<td>76,832</td>
<td>103,625</td>
<td>140,884</td>
<td>177,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortions averted</td>
<td>18,436</td>
<td>24,644</td>
<td>34,574</td>
<td>46,631</td>
<td>63,398</td>
<td>79,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe abortions averted</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>14,786</td>
<td>20,745</td>
<td>27,979</td>
<td>38,039</td>
<td>47,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal deaths averted</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBI infant deaths averted</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal YLL DALYs averted (mortality)</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>4,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal YLD DALYs averted (morbidity)</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBI infant DALYs averted (mortality)</td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>16,783</td>
<td>23,547</td>
<td>31,758</td>
<td>43,176</td>
<td>54,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total DALYs averted</td>
<td>14,747</td>
<td>19,606</td>
<td>27,357</td>
<td>36,696</td>
<td>49,485</td>
<td>62,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs saved to health care system*</td>
<td>6,682,661</td>
<td>8,932,807</td>
<td>12,532,409</td>
<td>16,902,820</td>
<td>22,980,237</td>
<td>28,994,439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Advantages of Impact 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Account for switching between providers</th>
<th>Account for previous LAPM service provision</th>
<th>Enter CPR goal and see provision needed*</th>
<th>Enter future provision and see CPR impact</th>
<th>Estimate health impacts-maternal deaths and births averted, etc</th>
<th>Estimate wider socio-economic impacts</th>
<th>Cost of providing services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Calculator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI DALY Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CPR goal for Spectrum and Reality ✓ based on national CPR. For Impact 2, based on percentage point increase in a programme’s contribution to the national CPR.
Limitations

- Data availability
  - Infrequent
  - Often regional rather than national

- Reliant on assumptions: LAPM discontinuation rates, mortality rates, pregnancy rates, method failure rates, etc.

- Some rates/coefficients held constant over time due to limited data (i.e. unmet need, abortion rates)

- To address limitations, including “high” and “low” estimates around key results
Next steps

- Draft model under external review
- Final model available early 2012
- Training materials – powerpoint, user manual, video
- All available on MSI website: www.mariestopes.org/Resources/Tools.aspx
- e-mail: research@mariestopes.org

Visit MSI stand for a demonstration
Thank you
Visit our stand for a demonstration

To find out more about how we are addressing unmet need by reaching the most underserved, please visit www.mariestopes.org