Examining the impact of subsidized vouchers on service use before and after public sector fees were removed: An evaluation of the Kenya safe motherhood voucher program

Mardieh L. Dennis, Timothy Abuya, Oona M. R. Campbell, Lenka Benova, Angela Baschieri, Matteo Quartagno, Ben Bellows





The windy path to financial protection in Kenya...

Colonial era User fees in all gov't facilities <u>1965/66</u> User fees removed & NHIF established

<u>1989</u> User fees reintroduced 2004 10/20 policy: fees removed at lower level facilities & social health insurance bill passed

2007 All fees removed for deliveries at lower level facilities

<u>**1990**</u> User fees suspended

1991-2003 User fees reintroduced 2013 Free maternity care in all gov't facilities

Safe motherhood voucher program



Demand side

Subsidized vouchers sold to poor women to be redeemed at facilities enrolled in the voucher program





Public & private sector facilities that met minimum standards in terms of staffing and infrastructure were accredited

Each facility was reimbursed at standard, pre-negotiated rates for each service provided

Facilities that failed to upkeep minimum standards risked losing their accreditation

Safe motherhood voucher program

• Implemented from 2006-2016



- Intervention covered five districts: Kiambu, Kilifi, Kisumu, Kitui, & Nairobi
- Program managed by PricewaterhouseCoopers on behalf of the Government of Kenya & supported by the German Development Bank (KfW)
- Evaluation managed by Population Council Kenya

Free maternity services policy



On 1 June 2013, the Kenyan government announced that maternity services were be provided for free in all public sector facilities across the country with immediate effect



From 2013-2016 both the voucher program & free maternity services (FMS) policy operated concurrently



Key research questions



What are the longer-term impacts of the voucher program on maternal health service use and sources of care?

Did any positive effects of the voucher program persist after the free maternity services policy was introduced in 2013?

Study design & analysis

- Repeated cross-sectional surveys conducted in 2010/11, 2012, & 2016 in 6 counties (3 voucher, 3 comparison)
- Multi-stage sampling of sub-locations & villages within the study counties
 - Within villages, poorest households selected for inclusion in study
- Women aged 15-49 years asked to report on maternal health service-seeking for all of their births in the previous five years
- Analysis compares outcomes at the community level, not voucher users vs. non-users



Statistical analysis

• Data from all three surveys pooled and births (N=7,136) were categorized into three periods:



- Mixed effects regression models accounting for clustering at the county sublocation, village, and woman levels
 - All results presented adjusted for: woman's age at birth, education, wealth, residence, marital status, employment, parity
- Conducted a difference-in-difference analysis to assess the impact of the safe motherhood voucher program on service-seeking & continuity of maternal care

Results: Use of maternal health services



BCOveriade objethAMC/0608/er No significant difference in cooptie siveres 117, Bemoore Use of 4+ ANC in Period 2 likely to receive 4+ ANC

Kola Benigo de Contra de C

In Period 2, births in Coverage OPPNC ~60% in Novightficoundifference Doth groups in Period 1 betyxenongrokplyitoRecionve PNC

Period 1: Pre-intervention/rollout **Period 2:** Full implementation of vouchers

Results: Continuum of care



In the project in the the second all three services was substantially lower than the proportion of the

Period 1: Pre-intervention/rollout **Period 2:** Full implementation of vouchers

Results: Sector of care for maternal health services



The public sector was the predominant provider across time for all three services

By Pension J, See of France in the source of the source of

Period 1: Pre-intervention/rollout **Period 2:** Full implementation of vouchers

Results: Sector of care across the continuum



In Period 1, private sector market share among users of complete & noaeeswah bealugitoatileastrowasenvillerfaomoa@coatelete& recommended care was similar between intervention groups than the private marketebaees or eacherteeuthties services individually

Period 1: Pre-intervention/rollout **Period 2:** Full implementation of vouchers

Results: Impact of the voucher program – service use

| | Pre-intervention/rollout to full implementation of voucher program | | Full implementation of voucher program to introduction of FMS policy | | |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| | Period 1 – Per | Period 1 – Period 2 | | Period 2 – Period 3 | |
| | D-in-D estimator [95% Cl] | p-value | D-in-D estimator [95% Cl] | p-value | |
| SERVICE USE | | | | | |
| 4+ ANC visits | 0.012 [-0.035, 0.059] | p=0.619 | 0.047 [-0.012, 0.105] | p=0.119 | |
| Facility delivery | 0.055 [0.013, 0.098] | p=0.011 | -0.049 [-0.102, 0.003] | p=0.064 | |
| PNC | 0.038 [-0.005, 0.081] | p=0.083 | 0.009 [-0.045, 0.063] | p=0.733 | |
| Complete care | 0.021 [-0.024, 0.066] | p=0.366 | 0.045 [-0.011, 0.101] | p=0.117 | |
| Recommended car | 0.000 [-0.031, 0.031] | p=0.999 | 0.057 [0.018, 0.096] | p=0.004 | |

Aftendetsettemperson vieweigen under her interneten and the second state of the second second

Results: Impact of the voucher program – sector of care

| | Pre-intervention/rollout to full nplementation of voucher program | | Full implementation of voucher program to introduction of FMS policy | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------|--|---------|--|--|
| | Period 1 – Period 2 | | Period 2 – Period 3 | | | |
| | D-in-D estimator [95% Cl] | p-value | D-in-D estimator [95% Cl] | p-value | | |
| PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET SHARE | | | | | | |
| ANC | 0.075 [0.043, 0.106] | p<0.001 | 0.025 [-0.015, 0.066] | p=0.218 | | |
| Facility delivery | 0.105 [0.049, 0.160] | p<0.001 | 0.000 [-0.059, 0.059] | p=1.000 | | |
| PNC | 0.110 [0.058, 0.162] | p<0.001 | -0.001 [-0.067, 0.048] | p=0.744 | | |
| Complete care | 0.147 [0.073, 0.222] | p<0.001 | -0.008 [-0.086, 0.070] | p=0.842 | | |
| Recommended care | •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | p=0.009 | -0.030 [-0.160, 0.100] | p=0.652 | | |

After the introduction of the FMS policy in public facilities, use of private Full implementation of the voucher service was associated with greater increases in sector services decreased among all births & there were no differences in use of private sector care for all indicators of service use and continuity of care the level of decrease between voucher and comparison counties

Summary & final thoughts

Voucher program was associated with <u>increased use</u> of:

(1) facility-based delivery care(2) private sector care

After free maternity services policy was introduced, voucher program was associated with:

(1) <u>lower increase</u> in use of facility-based delivery care
(2) <u>Increased use</u> of recommended care

Use of public sector services increased after free maternity services policy was introduced, but a significantly higher proportion of women in voucher counties continued to use private sector care



(1) Purchasing private sector care as a vehicle for increasing access to care among the poor?

(2) Role of accountability & oversight?

(3) Cannot ignore non-financial barriers

BMJ Global Health

Evaluating the impact of a maternal health voucher programme on service use before and after the introduction of free maternity services in Kenya: a quasi-experimental study

Mardieh L Dennis,¹ Timothy Abuya,² Oona Maeve Renee Campbell,¹ Lenka Benova,¹ Angela Baschieri,¹ Matteo Quartagno,¹ Benjamin Bellows³

Thank you!

Acknowledgements

This evaluation was supported by grants from 3ie & the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to the Population Council

My PhD research was funded by a +3 Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) studentship

mardieh.dennis@lshtm.ac.uk

