

**[Divya Parmar](#), Manuela de Allegri, Aurélia Souares,
Germain Savadogo and Rainer Sauerborn**

Equity impact of community-based health insurance (2004-2008)

Conference Item

Original citation:

Parmar, Divya and de Allegri, Manuela and Souares, Aurélia and Savadogo, Germain and Sauerborn, Rainer (2011) Equity impact of community-based health insurance (2004-2008). In: 3rd International Conference on Health Financing in Developing and Emerging Countries (CERDI), 11-13 May 2011, Université d'Auvergne, France. (Unpublished)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/46681/>

Available in LSE Research Online: October 2012

© 2011 The Authors

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.



Institute of Public Health
Heidelberg, Germany



Centre de Recherche en Santé de Nouna
Burkina Faso

Equity impact of community-based health insurance *(2004-2008)*

Divya Parmar, Manuela de Allegri, Aurélia Souares,
Germain Savadogo, Rainer Sauerborn

Equity in health financing

- Equity is an ethical principle
- Health care should be:
 1. financed according to *ability-to-pay*
 - **Horizontal Equity:** those who have the same ability-to-pay should pay the same
 - **Vertical Equity:** those with greater ability-to-pay should pay more
 2. accessed according to *need*

Reference: Culyer (1995)

The study

Data source: Household panel survey 2004-2008 (n=4695 individuals)

Equity focus:

- SES (poor vs. non-poor):

Asset-based SES index was created by Principal Components Analysis (PCA). Data on ownership of household assets (durable goods and livestock) and housing conditions were used. Quartile 1 (Q1) was considered as 'poor'.

- Gender (women vs. men)
- Age (children vs. adults)

Equity at 2 levels:

1. Equity in enrolment: Are the vulnerable groups enrolling into CBHI?
2. Equity in utilization: Are the vulnerable groups utilizing healthcare?

CBHI design & equity

- **Poor:** Premium subsidies for poor (Q1) households in every village, since 2007
- **Women:** No specific benefits.
 - Deliveries not covered by CBHI
 - Government: ANC free and since 2007, 80% subsidy on deliveries at public facilities
- **Children:** Premium subsidies, since the beginning (2004)
 - Government: Essential immunizations, malaria treatment & consultations

Equity in enrolment

Variable	OR	SE
Male	0.886	0.187
Child	0.456	0.132***
Poor	0.274	0.090***
Near	0.985	0.197
Household Size	1.027	0.011**
Ethnicity_Bwaba	0.961	0.235
Literate	1.974	0.403***
Year2005	1.792	0.436**
Year2006	0.890	0.216
Year2007	2.775	0.644***
Year2008	1.524	0.366*

- No gender effect
- Children less likely to enroll
- Poor less likely to enroll


Dependent variable: CHI (0,1)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Only those individuals who were offered CBHI were included (n=4695)

Equity in enrolment: *impact of subsidies*

Concentration curves: Before & after subsidy



Equity improved
Poor enrolling more after subsidy

Equity in utilization

Variable	OR	SE
Male	0.876	0.130
Child	0.565	0.175*
Poor	0.499	0.115***
CHI	2.182	0.531***
Near	1.454	0.212**
Household Size	1.016	0.009*
Ethnicity_Bwaba	1.155	0.183
Literate	1.545	0.230***
Year2005	1.904	0.231
Year2006	0.723	0.181
Year2007	0.826	0.212
Year2008	0.733	0.185

- No gender effect
- Children less likely to utilize
- Poor less likely to utilize

Dependent variable: Facility care (0,1)
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Only those individuals who reported being sick in the previous month at the time of the survey were included (n=1710)

Equity in utilization


Variable	OR	SE
Male	0.876	0.130
Child	0.565	0.175*
Poor	0.499	0.115***
CHI	2.182	0.531***
Near	1.454	0.212**
Household Size	1.016	0.009*
Ethnicity_Bwaba	1.155	0.183
Literate	1.545	0.230***
Year2005	1.904	0.231
Year2006	0.723	0.181
Year2007	0.826	0.212
Year2008	0.733	0.185

- No gender effect
- Children less likely to utilize
- Poor less likely to utilize

But, are enrolled poor women and children utilizing care more than the non-enrolled?

Equity in utilization: *SES*


Utilization by enrolment status




Utilization slightly more among poor who enrolled
(CC above line of equality for poorest)

Equity in utilization: *gender*

Women, by enrolment status



Men, by enrolment status




**Among women: utilization more among poor women who enrolled
(CC above line of equality)**


**Among men: no difference in utilization for poor
(For non-poor, utilization slightly less for enrolled)**

Equity in utilization: *age*

Children, by enrolment status



Adults, by enrolment status



Among children: utilization more among poor children who enrolled
(CC above line of equality)

Among adults: utilization more among poor adults who enrolled
(CC above line of equality for poor)

Results

1. Equity in enrolment

- Poor: enrolment increased after subsidy (still pro-rich)
- Children less likely to enroll
- No gender effect

2. Equity in utilization

- Poor: slight increase in utilization for those that enrolled
- Women: pro-poor effect for those that enrolled
- Children: pro-poor effect for those that enrolled

Note: Shows the status with and without CBHI; but does not mean that CBHI caused changes in utilization

Implications for National Health Insurance

- **Poor: Premium subsidy essential but not enough**
 - Less likely to enroll. Even after enrolling less likely to utilize care
 - Other costs, health awareness, behavior at health facilities, sensitization....
- **Children: Premium subsidy essential but not enough**
 - Less likely to enroll. However, once enrolled utilize care
 - Continue free/subsidized services for children at health facilities
 - Sensitization to increase enrolment
- **Women: Premium subsidies not essential**
 - Continue free/subsidized maternal care at health facilities

Thank you

Divya Parmar
Parmar@uni-heidelberg.de
Institute of Public Health
Heidelberg University
Germany

