

**What is the impact of social health
protection on access to health care, health
expenditure and impoverishment?**

**A comparative analysis of three
African countries**

***DISCUSSION PAPER
NUMBER 2- 2006***

*Department "Health System Financing" (HSF)
Cluster "Evidence and Information for Policy" (EIP)*

World Health Organization 2006 ©

This document is not a formal publication of the World Health Organization (WHO), and all rights are reserved by the Organization. The document may, however, be freely reviewed, abstracted, reproduced or translated, in part or in whole, but not for sale or for use in conjunction with commercial purposes.

*These authors were responsible for the coordination of this joint ILO-WHO study and writing of the comparative analysis. All others were involved in the analysis of country household surveys and the interpretation of results. Frikkie Booysen (University of Bloemfontein, South Africa), Karine Lamiraud (University of Lausanne), Abay Asfaw (currently IFPRI, Washington) and Stephen Muchiri (Ministry of Health, Kenya) carried out their research with the organizations mentioned at the time of the study. Johannes Juetting (OECD) contributed to this paper in his own capacity. We wish to acknowledge the financial support of the GTZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) for this study. WHO also thanks the NIA for co-funding this study (grant number Y1-AG-9421). Note that the authors' views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of their respective organizations.

**What is the impact of social health
protection on access to health care,
health expenditure and impoverishment?**

**A comparative analysis of
three African countries**

by

Xenia Scheil-Adlung*, Abay Asfaw,
Frikkie Booysen, Karine Lamiraud, Emmanuel Reynaud
ILO

Johannes Juetting*
OECD

Ke Xu*, Guy Carrin*, Somnath Chatterji,
David Evans, Chris James and Stephen Muchiri.
WHO



**World Health
Organization**

**GENEVA
2006**

1. Introduction

Despite progress, the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) will not be easy and remains an important challenge. A better protection of the poor against health risks is crucial in this endeavour. Obviously, poor health drastically impedes the social and economic development of a country: beyond directly affecting people's well-being (reduced life expectancy, high infant mortality, spread of infectious diseases etc.) poor health also lowers the productivity of labor and menaces the entire economy.

Access to health services typically requires out-of-pocket payments. According to WHO (2003) data, out of pocket payments (OOP) account for 1/3 of total health care spending in 2/3 of all low-income countries. In most African countries the amount of OOP is well above this average (Drechsler and Jütting 2005). Such payments can lead individuals or households to reduce their expenditures for basic needs such as for food, housing and clothing, to borrow money and to sell household assets. As a result, some households are pushed into poverty. Furthermore, out-of-pocket payments may lead to denied access to needed services or preventing from receiving a full course of needed treatment. This might result in a vicious cycle of poverty from which it is difficult to escape in an already impoverished environment. Providing access to affordable health services can alleviate the financial burden of households and improve their ability to generate income.

Recently, there is an increasing focus on social health protection via health insurance as a potential promising way to better to deal with health risks in developing countries. However, the empirical basis for a profound analysis of the effects of health insurance is still very thin. Against this background the ILO, WHO, and the OECD Development Centre sponsored by GTZ have undertaken a collaborative research project in this field. This paper summarizes the results of three individual research projects (Asfaw, 2005; Lamiraud et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2005) measuring the impact of membership in a health insurance scheme in three African countries, namely Kenya, Senegal and South Africa.

The structure of the paper is as follows. The first section of this paper is briefly outlining the health care systems in Kenya, Senegal and South Africa followed by a short description of the methodology and data used. The later sections focus on empirical results and policy implications.

2. Brief overview of organization and financing of the health systems in Kenya, Senegal and South Africa

The three countries selected, Kenya, Senegal, and South Africa vary substantially in economic development and health conditions (table 1). South Africa is the richest country in sub-Saharan Africa; in 2001 its gross domestic product (GDP) was in terms of international dollar 7538. In Kenya it amounted to 1452 and 1323 for Senegal. Between 1990 and 2002, the percentage of the population living below one dollar per day ranged between 26.3 highest in Senegal and with 7.1 lowest in South Africa. Kenya lies with 23 % close to Senegal.

II.1. Table 1. Kenya, Senegal and South Africa: Basic data

	GDP in \$	Population living below 1 \$ /day 1990 – 2002 in %	Life expectancy	Child mortality under 5 years (Boys/Girls)	HIV/AIDS Prevalence
		1)			2)
Kenya	1452	23	50.9	119/113	6.7
Senegal	1323	26.3	55.8	139/129	1
South Africa	7538	7.1	50.7	86/81	15.2

1) Human Development Report 2003 and 2004, www.undp.org

2) Adult population; HIV/AIDS and work, global estimates, impacts and responses; ILO, 2004

3) Other data from WHO-website

For life expectancy, Senegal is the highest among the three countries, 55.8 years. It is followed by Kenya (50.9 years) and South Africa (50.7 years). Child mortality under 5 is much lower in South Africa (86 per thousand for boys and 81 for girls) than in Kenya (119 for boys and 113 for girls) and Senegal (139 for boys and 129 for girls).

Many African countries face the challenge of improving access to health care while struggling with the burdens of the recent HIV/AIDS pandemic, other persistent infectious diseases and severe overall economic constraints on financing of health services. Among the three countries the HIV/AIDS prevalence is with 15.2 % among the adult population highest in South Africa, followed by Kenya, 6.7 and Senegal with 1 %.

The organizational and financial arrangements of health systems play a critical role in improving health service access and protecting households from severe financial loss. All three countries have an important tax-based component in their health financing system. However, various forms of compulsory and voluntary insurance schemes have been introduced in a supplementary way. For example, in Kenya, we find a compulsory hospital insurance (organized by the National Hospital Insurance Fund - NHIF) that covers government and formal sector employees and their family members; therefore, NHIF only covers 7 % of the population.

Other social health protection mechanisms include health maintenance organizations (HMO), private health insurance, community-based health insurance and various mutual help groups (Harambee). Children under 5 years old are entitled to free primary health services from public facilities. The poor are also entitled to free health care from public facilities in principle, but there is no uniform standard on who, how much and what services are exempted. Kenya passed the law on National Social Health Insurance in December 2004, which is an extension of the current NHIS with an attempt to cover the whole population. (ref. Joint Mission Report).

In Senegal, company and inter-company health insurance institutions (IPMs) are running the statutory social health protection scheme. Accordingly, formal sector workers and their families are covered. Besides the statutory scheme, community based health insurance schemes have emerged, particularly mutual health organizations (MHOs). In 2001 the coverage of IPMs amounted to some 700,000 persons and the number of persons covered in MHOs around 422,000 persons in a total population of 9.8 Million. (County Fall, Extending health insurance in Senegal, ESS –Paper No 9).

The social health protection scheme in South Africa is split into a public and private sector. The large public sector covering 83.7 % of the population is financed by the State and offers basic care depending on income testing. Government spending is used to provide service through public facilities to all population with various user fees for different services and at different administrative regions.

The private sector consists of medical schemes, which often operate on a community-rating environment based on risk profiles. Although social health insurance has been under serious discussion in recent years, employment-based private insurance is still the main type of scheme in the country.

Total health spending in all three countries includes prepayment through general tax, social health insurance and private health insurance, and out-of-pocket payment. External resources are also an important component for Senegal (16.9% of total health expenditure) and Kenya (16.4% of total health expenditure).

Although both prepayment and out-of-pocket payment are expenditures made eventually by households, they are fundamentally different in financing health care. Prepayment mechanisms improve equal access to services and protect households from financial loss while out-of-pocket payments can be a barrier for accessing health services and a heavy financial burden of ill health to a household.

In South Africa, total health expenditure is 8.7% of GDP in 2002, among which 40.6% is from governments, 47% from private prepayment schemes and 12.4% from out-of-pocket payments (Table 2) (country reports / WHR-2005). Out-of-pocket payment as a share of total health expenditure is low by both African and worldwide standards. However, the population covered by any health insurance is less than 20% (country reports / Xu, Evans, Kawabata, et al. 2003).

The relative spending on health in Kenya stands at 4.9% of GDP. Government spending on health in Kenya consists 44% of total health expenditure. Private prepayment schemes and the NGO contributions are 11.2%. Out-of-pocket payments are 44.8%, the highest among the three countries.

Total health expenditure as a percentage of GDP in Senegal is similar to Kenya which is 5.1%. Government spending on health is about 45.2% of total health expenditure. Out-of-pocket payment is about 43.6%. The NGOs and private prepayment schemes contribute 11.2% of total health expenditure although the community-based health insurance is increasing. Governments and a few formal private sector entities provide health care

benefits covering limited services for their employees. One of the important goals in the ten-year National Health Development Plan (PNDS) 1997-2007 is to improve the access of vulnerable groups to high quality health services (Senegal government).

Table 2. Organization and financing of health care systems in Kenya, Senegal and South Africa: Basic data

	Total expenditure as % of GDP	Government Spending in % of total expenditure	Out-of-pocket payments in % of total expenditure	Private prepayments in % of total expenditure	Coverage of population in %
Kenya	4.9	44	44.8	11.2	7 (NHIF)
Senegal	5.1	45.2	43.6	11.2	11.4 (IMPs and MOHs)
South Africa	8.7	40.6	12.4	47	17 (all health care plans)

3. Data and Methodology

3.1. Framework of the analysis

The definition of social health protection in this study is viewed broadly. It includes all kinds of health financing protection mechanisms, from tax-based financing, statutory social health insurance to private health insurance, community-based health insurance, and various fee exemptions for health services.

In this particular study, however, we focus on the net impact of insurance mechanisms, including statutory schemes, various types of private non-profit and for-profit health insurance, mutual benefit organizations and micro-insurance. This is not to say, however, that all schemes stand alone and are able to protect against 'all' health care costs. In fact, in quite a number of cases members receive indirect protection from government that may pay for health infrastructure, staff salaries, drug kits, etc. In other words, in those cases the financial protection given to patient is ensured through a combination of government funding and insurance revenues.

The analysis aims at highlighting the poverty implications related to ill health on all segments of the population, including the poor and their households, by evaluating the quantitative impact of health care costs on households covered by health insurance schemes as compared to those without any health insurance coverage. As tax-based funding normally benefits the entire population, it will not be specified as one of the social health protection schemes in this study.

Out-of-pocket payments are part of a household's total health care payments that also include health insurance contributions/premiums and even the imputed taxes allocated to health through the government budget. However, in this study we concentrate on out-of-pocket payments, as it is consistently indicated by previous studies, that they are the ones

that trigger households' financial catastrophe.

The analysis focuses on linkages between the use of health services and households' financial risk on the one hand, and income and health insurance status on the other. The key indicators in this study include: extent of coverage of social health protection, health service utilization, catastrophic health expenditure, financial sources for paying for health services and poverty impact.

These key indicators are estimated from cross-section household surveys. The comparison focuses on the distribution across different socio-economic groups rather than the average level of each indicator. The impact of social protection schemes on the use of services and financial risk protection is identified after controlling other socio-economic indicators using appropriate econometric methods. It also highlights the characteristics of the vulnerable groups, which need greater protection.

3.2. Variables defined

- Coverage of social health protection

Coverage refers to the percentage of the population covered by any health insurance scheme, including statutory schemes, various types of private health insurance, mutual benefit organizations and micro-insurances.

- Health service utilization

Health service utilization is measured by a ratio of the individuals using services to those who reported illness (or need) in a certain period of time. The time frame for utilization varies from country to country depending on different survey instruments.

- Catastrophic health expenditure

Catastrophic expenditure is defined as out-of-pocket payments for one or more household members equal to or above 40% of a household's capacity to pay.

The capacity to pay relates to the constraint of reducing expenditure on other necessities for a period of time. It is measured as a household's total expenditure minus its subsistence needs. The subsistence need is estimated using the food expenditure of the household with the median food share in total household expenditure which is then adjusted for household size. This subsistence need is used as the poverty line in the poverty impact analysis

Out-of-pocket health payment refers to payments made by households at the time of receiving health services. Out-of-pocket payments typically include doctors' consultation fees, purchases of medication and hospital bills. Although spending on alternative and/or traditional medicine is included in out-of-pocket payments, expenditure on health-related transportation and special nutrition are excluded. It is also important to note that out-of-pocket payments are net of any insurance reimbursement.

- Financial sources for health services payments

Financial sources used to pay for health services reflect the burden of ill-health to a household. In addition to a reduction of funds available for other basic expenditure categories, borrowing money and selling of assets have been reported in all three countries.

- Poverty impact

Poverty impact includes the incidence and intensity of poverty due to out-of-pocket health payments. The incidence of poverty is measured by the percentage of households who were not poor before but become poor after paying for health services. This is also referred to as impoverishment.

The impact of intensity of poverty is measured by the difference in the normalized poverty gap before and after health payments. The poverty gap indicates the average amount per household that would be needed to bring all the poor above the poverty line. As the currencies used by each country are different the normalized poverty gap (the poverty gap divided by the poverty line) allows across country comparison.

3.3. Econometric models

A multiple logistic regression is used in exploring the socio-economic characteristics associated with the coverage of social protection. The same regression model is also applied to testing the impact of social protection on health service utilization, catastrophic expenditures, financial burden and poverty impact by controlling all the other social economic indicators, such as income, age, sex, education and so on.

Being aware that there could be unobservable characteristics which influence health insurance coverage, as well as health service utilization and out-of-pocket payments, an endogeneity test is performed (using the Hausman test or the bivariate probit model) when the impact of health insurance membership was found to be statistically significant in the equations for health service utilization and out-of-pocket expenditure. In the three case studies the hypothesis of endogeneity could be rejected, however.

3.4. Data

Data used in the research project are from 2003 household surveys. All the three surveys are national representative:

- Data for both South Africa and Senegal are from the World Health Surveys (WHS) using the same survey instrument.
- Data for Kenya are from the Household Expenditure and Utilization Survey (HEU). The instrument used in this survey is different from the WHS.

All the surveys include information on the coverage of social health protection, health service utilization, household consumption expenditures, out-of-pocket health payments, and general socio-economic indicators.

It should be noted that household consumption expenditures were collected differently in the two types of surveys. In the HEU, household expenditures were recorded in 38 items (excluding health expenditures) for one month on frequent spending and one year on less frequent spending, such as purchasing of durable goods. Health spending in HEU came from the health section. In the WHS, household expenditures were recorded in 5 items excluding health expenditure and all for one month. Health spending in the WHS is collected in the expenditure section in 8 items for a one-month period.

Experience shows that in a household survey the more detailed the items on expenditures the higher the number obtained. The different instruments used in these two types of survey will compromise the comparability on the average level of catastrophic expenditure across countries. However, the distribution across socio-economic groups among the three countries is still comparable. This also relates to the fact that the comparison is more focused on the distribution rather than the level.

Furthermore, questions on health service needs were framed differently in the two types of surveys. In the WHS the question asks when was the last time the respondent needed health service with multiple choices on the duration of time, from last 30 days, to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 years ago. Obviously people are more likely to remember the occasions when they actually went to see a doctor. In HEU, the question begins with whether the person was ill or not in the last four weeks, which is a common approach to this question in many surveys. This difference will make the utilization rate less comparable across countries.

4. The impact of social health protection coverage: comparative empirical analysis

4.1. Coverage of social health protection

First, we wish to reiterate that the 'social health protection' we refer to is to be understood as that offered by various health insurance schemes that are organized in a way that is supplementary to the protection that is offered via tax-based funding. Results from the surveys reflect the fact that social health protection is rather limited in South Africa, the richest country in the region, the population covered by any form of health insurance is only 12.3%. In Kenya the coverage is 9.1% and in Senegal 4.2%. Compared to information provided in section 2, insured persons in South Africa and Senegal are slightly smaller from the surveys.

Although the level of coverage varies substantially in all three countries, the distribution across income groups is fairly similar. The lower income groups have fewer people covered by social health protection schemes compared to the higher income groups (figure1). For example, in Kenya 2.3% of the poorest quintile are covered while the richest quintile has coverage of 24.7%. Results also show that higher population coverage at the national level does not necessarily reduce the difference in coverage among income

groups.




Table 3 lists the results from the multiple logistic regression. A positive sign indicates that the individual with that characteristic is more likely to be covered by a social protection scheme than those without this characteristic given that all other conditions are the same. A negative sign indicates the opposite direction.

The results suggest some common socio-economic characteristics associated with the coverage of social protection in all three countries:

- *Income* is the factor that has a positive relationship with social health protection coverage. The higher the income the greater the likelihood of being covered by a scheme. This also confirms the descriptive results and the result holds in all three countries.
- *Education* is another variable that shows the positive link to social health protection coverage across all three countries.
- There is no significant difference in coverage between *male and female*, or by different health conditions in all three countries. This implies that females and people with poor health who need more health care services are not given special attention in the current schemes.
- Being employed is associated with social health protection in South Africa and Kenya as in both countries main health insurances are employment-based. There is no significant difference regarding the *employment status* in Senegal meaning that here employment related health protection schemes do not cover significantly more or less persons than other schemes.
- People living in *urban areas* are more likely to be covered by a social health protection scheme in Kenya and Senegal; the difference is not statistically significant in South Africa.
- *Ethnic groups*, specifically the high income English speaking population in South Africa, are more likely to be protected than other groups.
- *Seniors* in South Africa are more likely to be covered by social health protection schemes, but not in Senegal and Kenya. In Kenya, this is due to the exclusion of people over 65 years, who are not even eligible for membership in the National Hospital Insurance Funds, the biggest health insurance scheme in Kenya.

Table 3. Effects of indicators on social health protection coverage

Indicators	South Africa	Kenya	Senegal
Income	+	+	+
Education	+	+	+
Sex	Ns	ns	ns
Health condition	Ns	ns	ns
Employment	+	+	ns
Urban	Ns	+	+
Ethnic group	+	ns	NA
Senior person	+	ns	ns

Note: Significance level is set at 5% level.

ns: not significant;

+: positive effect

NA, the variable is not available.


-: negative effect

Given the characteristics of the insured population outlined above, it can be concluded that in all three countries the current social health protection schemes are lacking coverage of specific, most likely vulnerable, groups of the population. The social protection deficit concerns particularly households with low or no income, persons without formal employment, women and rural households. In Kenya and Senegal, the elderly are particularly neglected. These excluded groups should be given more attention when implementing and reforming social health protection schemes.

4.2. Impact of social health protection on utilization

Social health protection aims at ensuring access to services without causing financial catastrophe for the individual or the household, e.g. those who could otherwise not afford the needed services. Therefore, in general, it is a desired result of social health protection, that the insured are more likely to use health services than the uninsured whose access is only supported via the tax-based funding. Utilization of health care services will probably increase after implementation of social protection schemes if one considers currently prevailing under-utilization in developing countries (Dor and van der Gaag 1993, Müller et al. 1996). At the same time the insured might use more services than necessary (moral hazard). The surveys used in this study do not provide sufficient information to separate the moral hazard effect.

Results from all three countries in the univariate analysis show that the insured use more outpatient services than the non-insured with perceived illness (figure 2).



Concerning the reasons for not seeking care in Senegal, 85 % of respondents in the poorest income quintile cited "could not afford" as the principal reason, whereas availability of services ("could not get health care") seems to be a minor problem. Comparable results were observed regarding affordability of medicines prescribed (figure 3).

What is the impact of health insurance on seeking care if needed? In Senegal, among the group of the non-insured, affordability of health services is a major barrier for two thirds of the non-insured as compared to one third of the insured. As regards of affordability of medicines prescribed, more than 63% of the non-insured mentioned this reason, whereas no insured person raised this issue (figure 4).

Accordingly, financial barriers to access health services are conceived to be more important than e.g. geographical barriers. The results of univariate analysis reveal further, that the insured are more likely to get health care given need than the non-insured and less likely to not seeking care due to affordability issues.

III.1. Figure 3. Health Care Utilization Indicators in Senegal





Figure 4. Health Care Utilization by Insurance Status in Senegal



The impact of social health protection on the use of health services is further examined using a multiple logistic regression model. The regression is applied to the sample that reported illness in a month previous to the interview. Results suggest that controlling the income, education, age, sex, employment status, urban/rural location, health condition and ethnic groups, the insured uses more health services than the uninsured in South Africa and Senegal.

In Kenya, the impact of social protection on outpatient services is not statistically significant, as the main insurance, the NHIF, does not cover outpatient services. For inpatient services, the NHIF coverage has a positive effect at 20% statistical significant level (table 4).

Other socio-economic indicators also influence the use of health services. Income and education are found to have a positive effect on utilization in both Kenya and Senegal but not in South Africa. Urban location does not have a significant impact on utilization controlling all the other variables. Sex makes no difference on service utilization in South Africa and Kenya, but females are more likely to use services controlling all the other indicators in Senegal. Use of health services by older persons varies among these three countries. Given all the other indicators the same, in South Africa the senior population are more likely to use health services than other age groups. An opposite situation is found in Kenya while in Senegal there is no significant difference in the use of health service by the senior and non-senior population.

Table 4. Effects of indicators on health service utilization

Indicators	South Africa	Kenya	Senegal
Insurance	+	ns (+ [*] , for inpatient)	+
Income	Ns	+	+
Education	Ns	+	+
Male	Ns	Ns	-
Health condition	Ns	-	NA
Employment	Ns	Ns	NA
Urban	Ns	Ns	ns
Ethnic group	Ns	Ns	NA
Senior person	+	-	ns

Note: Significance level is set at 10% level except * which indicate 20% level.

ns: not significant;

NA: the variable is not available.

+: positive;

-: negative


4.3. Impact of social health protection on poverty

Health services are essential to improve people's health and health is a necessary prerequisite to generate income. Payments required to access health services and illness-related inability to carry out paid work affect greatly the financial situation of a household. In order to cope with the financial loss some households reduce their basic needs spending, such as expenditures for food, housing and clothing others sell their assets, fall into poverty or deepen their current state of poverty.

In the following we analyse the impact of social health protection on catastrophic expenditure, income generation, households' strategies to finance health care costs and poverty alleviation.

4.3.1. Social health protection and catastrophic expenditure

Catastrophic expenditure occurs when the required payments for the service are equal to or exceeds 40% of a household's non-subsistence spending. Results show that being covered by a social protection program reduces a household's financial loss to some extent, but it does not fully ensure that the household is protected from facing catastrophic health expenditure. A simple tabulation result shows that the percentage of households with catastrophic expenditure is lower among the insured than the uninsured in all three countries while the magnitude of the difference varies across countries (figure 5).



The Multiple logit regression results confirm that the insured households are less likely to face catastrophic expenditure than the uninsured in Senegal (table 5). However, in South Africa it only works for the richest quintile and in Kenya no significant impact emerges. This result may not be surprising given the fact that in South Africa, the rich enjoy a better benefit package through different insurance schemes than the poor who are only entitled very limited benefit from public program or low cost insurance schemes. In Kenya the insurance coverage is mostly based on employment status and the main insurance program NHIF only covers inpatient service with a high cost-sharing rate by patients. Two important results emerge from the analysis: First, social health protection can help to better shield households against financial shocks. Secondly, however, the current forms of health insurance are far from being complete or perfect.

Other socio-economic indicators, such as rural locations are associated with a higher probability of facing catastrophic expenditure in all three countries. Further, households with members under five years old are more likely to face catastrophic expenditure in Senegal while the opposite result is obtained in Kenya. The policy of free services to children under five years old in Kenya could contribute to this result.

Having senior members in a household who need more health services often is a risk factor for facing catastrophic expenditure. However, the empirical results do not show a positive correlation between senior member and incidence of catastrophic expenditures in any of the three countries. Several reasons could contribute to this result: the population above 60 years old is relatively small in Kenya (4.9%) and Senegal (4.2%); and the senior person may use less service when needed due to both financial and geographical barriers.

Table 5. Socio-economic characteristics associated with catastrophic health expenditures

Indicators	South Africa	Kenya	Senegal
Insurance	ns (first 3 quintiles) + (4 th quintile) - (5 th quintile)	ns	-
Income (1 st quintile as control group)			
2 nd quintile	Ns	-	ns
3 rd quintile	Ns	-	ns
4 th quintile	+	-	-
5 th quintile	-	-	-
Education	NA	-	-
Urban	NA	-	-
Child under 5yrs	NA	-	+
Senior person	NA	ns	ns

Note: Significance level is set at 10% level.

ns: not significant; NA: the variable is not available.

+: positive; -: negative

4.3.3. Social health protection and households' strategies to finance health care

In order to cope with the financial burden of ill health, households use various strategies to draw on all kinds of financial sources, such as using up savings, reducing other expenses including basic needs, borrowing money from relatives, friends or financial institutions and selling assets such as livestock and land if cash savings are not sufficient.

All strategies have an impact on current and future welfare of households. Borrowing money and sale of assets particularly have long-term impact on households' financial situation and income generation capacity. Both strategies are not rare in all these three countries.

Health insurance coverage seems to reduce the need to sell assets in case of financial difficulty in both Kenya and Senegal, but not South Africa. In Senegal, 15.4 % of non-insured households sold assets so as to finance health care services compared to 4.4% % of insured households (table 6). In addition, health insurance coverage reduces the probability of borrowing, except in Kenya.

Table 6. Household financial mechanisms to cope with health care expenses (%)

	South Africa		Kenya		Senegal	
	Uninsured	Insured	Uninsured	Insured	Uninsured	Insured
Sales of assets	5.9%	10.6%	1.0%	0.2%	15.4%	4.4%
Borrowing from family or friends	10.5%	7.0%	4.1%	4.3%	27.9%	12.3%
Borrowing from outside	11.5%	3.0%			13.2%	6.1%

4.3.4. Social health protection and depth of poverty


Poor health triggers poverty. Households just above the poverty line are easily pushed into poverty for even a small amount of expenses on health services. Further, within poor households poverty might be deepened by health expenditure. These facts have been confirmed in numerous research findings and led to special attention and conclusions of the international community e.g. in establishing health-related MDGs, the WHO Commission on Macroeconomics and Health and ILO resolutions and conclusions on a new consensus in social security.

The impoverishment due to health payments is between 1.5% and 5.4% of households across the three countries. This translates to over 100,000 households in Kenya and Senegal and about 290,000 households in South Africa being pushed under the poverty line by paying for health services. Furthermore, in all three countries, out-of-pocket health payments deepened the level of poverty of the already poor. Before health payments the poverty gap was (figure 6)

- 37% of the poverty line in South Africa
- 25% in Kenya and
- 54% in Senegal.

After health payments the poverty gap was enlarged to

- 41% in South Africa
- 27% in Kenya and
- 64% in Senegal



It can be concluded that besides impoverishing non-poor households, health expenditure enlarges the poverty gap among the poor. The results reveal also that social health protection can help to reduce impoverishment. However, under the current health

financing system in all three countries, the poor have very limited social protection coverage, therefore, the impact of coverage on the intensity of poverty is not expected at an observable level from the cross-section sampled surveys.

5. Summary of findings and policy implications

In Kenya, Senegal and South Africa, the level of coverage of any form of health insurance is very low ranging from 7 to 17 %. At the same time, out-of-pocket payments are very high in Senegal and Kenya which account to about 45% of total health expenditure in both countries.

This implies that the majority of the population working in both the formal and informal economy is not benefiting from social health protection programs. Further, it could be shown that the social health protection deficit concerns particularly vulnerable groups in the three countries, such as people living close to or in poverty, persons living in rural regions, women and the elderly.

The analysis of the financial impact of (lacking) social health protection on access to health services, expenditure and poverty revealed that health care cost constitute a very high barrier to access health services for households in need.

Under the situation of insufficient tax-based funding, social health protection schemes can reduce this barrier. The results of the study showed that the insured are more likely to get health care if needed. Further, social health protection has the potential to reduce lacking income generation due to sickness and protect households from hazardous, wealth threatening health financing strategies such as borrowing money or selling assets to cover health care cost. Against this background, social health protection can play an important role in reducing impoverishment.

These results confirm the importance of political strategies setting priorities in extending coverage of social protection schemes to the poor and investing in social health protection development. The following policy recommendations are put forward to improve access to social health protection, reduce the financial burden and impoverishment due to health expenditure:

- Extending coverage to the poor and vulnerable
- Providing benefit packages and adjusting cost sharing
- Policy considerations beyond the health sector

5.1. Extending social health insurance coverage to the poor and vulnerable

Currently in all three studied countries the limited social health protection coverage principally benefits persons in the formal economy. The poor who have low capacity to pay and the vulnerable that need more services are not given even the same attention as the rest of the population. Specific programs, e.g. targeting children under 5 years old and

the poor, fall short of expectations. This situation is also common in among other developing countries. Therefore, extending social health protection to the poor should be a priority.

While social health protection schemes generally have the potential to mitigate the worst financial effects of ill health on poor households, it is not possible to develop a single right model for all countries or even for all types of vulnerability and poverty within one country.

There are different strategies to enhance effectiveness of social health protection in changing social and economic environments. Whereas improving performance and coverage of statutory social health protection schemes seems to be straightforward for formal sector workers if principles of good governance, solid financing and administration are applied, it is very complex to reach the often vulnerable and poor people living and working in the informal sector.

In order to reach this group social protection strategies need to take into account specific approaches regarding identification of persons, adjusting to reduced capacities to pay for contributions, arranging for specific needs and health risks. Even these modifications of the protection scheme will not ensure that regulations can be enforced.

To reach the majority of the population working in the informal sector in African countries will require besides improvement of publicly provided health, to better integrate schemes that are based on collective risk sharing at the community level. The emerging movement of mutual health organizations and micro-insurance schemes in African countries is very interesting in this respect. Programs have either been initiated by health care providers (e.g., hospitals), Non-Governmental-Organizations, or local associations. Schemes are generally limited to a specific region or community and thus only reach a small number of people.

Moreover, health insurance packages are not comprehensive despite these limitations, MHI is a promising approach to extend health care coverage to otherwise excluded individuals. Specifically, MHI has the potential to integrate a large part of the rural population in Africa which would otherwise be left with no or very little health care coverage. Although the scope of each individual scheme is very restricted, there are different ways to scale up coverage. They include building federations between schemes and using community institutions, such as cooperatives, to disseminate the insurance product and link community efforts with public efforts, e.g. through subsidies. . This requires creating "attractive" schemes with low transaction costs.

The challenge ahead for policymakers lies in the need to encourage scaling up of schemes up and linking them to public policies. This requires a careful balancing for regulation in order to leave enough space for these schemes to develop

5.2 Providing adequate benefit packages and adjusting cost sharing

Health services covered by social protection programs are essential for protecting people from severe financial loss. Households may still experience devastating financial consequences even when covered by insurance if the benefit package is not comprehensive (Himmelstein U D, Warren E, Thorne D & Woolhandler S).

There is no gold standard on the benefit package, but its overall objective should be protecting the poor and vulnerable against catastrophic health costs. There is experience in practice suggesting that a restricted benefit package would be less successful in protecting against catastrophic expenditure. In Kenya, where the NHIF covers only inpatient services (specifically the hospital bed expense) there is evidence that catastrophic expenditure due to outpatient services is not rare (country reports).

It is not, however, the larger the benefit package the better. The size of the benefit package involves a balance between cost and risk protection. Given scarce resources, it is necessary to set priorities in benefit packages and other components of the scheme design in order cover the needs of the poor. Priority setting should be based on medical guidelines, evidence based medicine and all kinds of certification/quality assurance.

5.3 Policy considerations and research needs beyond the health sector

South Africa, Kenya and Senegal are facing great challenges on their way to reach universal health coverage. People impoverished by health payments or unable to access services due to financial barriers are numerous in all three countries. Meanwhile great efforts are being made in these countries to expand social protection programs in order to allow widespread access to needed services, minimize households' severe financial loss and break the cycle of illness and poverty. It is obvious from the above discussion that there is no one-fits-all solution.

Policy interventions in the area of social protection have concentrated in the past largely on the supply side, e.g. via subsidizing public health care facilities, providers and MOH. Recently, a change can be observed and demand side of the health care system comes increasingly into the focus of policy makers. Patients are more and more considered as economic agents instead of purely as beneficiaries or target groups and are seen as actors who interplay with other stakeholders such as providers, government authorities, etc. This is an important step forward, though not sufficient. As households face several risks at the same time – beside health risks, production risks etc. – only a holistic strategy to deal with risk and vulnerability will have a long lasting impact.

The topic of risk and vulnerability is gaining more and more attention in the international arenas. In their current work on pro-poor growth the donor community (DAC member countries) has set up a specific task force analysing the relationship between risk and vulnerability on the one hand and poverty, inequality and growth on the other hand. One major conclusion of this work is that while in the last years important knowledge has been accumulated in estimating the costs of being unprotected against shocks, far less progress has been made in discussing what kind of policies and instruments are

appropriate in a given context to improve existing risk sharing arrangements. Much more work is needed in this area. An important step forward would be to include systematically risk analysis in the PRSP process as well as to do further research to identify policies and instruments that help people to deal with risks more effectively. Progress in health protection would be particular welcome as labour is often the only asset of the poor. Increasing labour productivity is a cornerstone of any pro-poor growth strategies that aim to achieve the MDGs.

References

Asfaw A. 2004. The Impact of Social Health protection Mechanisms on Access to Health Care, Health Expenditure and Impoverishment: A Case Study of Senegal. Unpublished research paper

Lamiraud K., Booyesen F., Scheil-Adlung X. 2005. The Impact of Social Health Protection on Access to Health Care, Health Expenditure and Impoverishment:

A Case Study of South Africa. Unpublished research paper

Xu K., James C., Carrin G., Muchiri S. 2005. An empirical model of access to health care, health care expenditure and impoverishment in Kenya: learning from past reforms and lessons for the future. Unpublished research paper.

Booyesen, F. le R., 2003. Urban-rural Inequalities in Health Care Delivery in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 20(4): 657-671.

Rabazon, H., 2004. Health and Democracy in the twenty-first century: The extension of social dialogue to health care decision-making, Geneva (unpublished working paper).

Castro-Leal, F. et al. 2000. Public spending on Health in Africa: Do the poor benefit?

Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 78 (1), 66 – 74.

Drechsler, D. and Jütting, J. (2005) : Private Health Insurance in Low- and Middle Income Countries. Scope, Limitations and Policy Responses. Paper presented at the « Wharton Impact Conference on Voluntary Health Insurance in Developing Countries », March 2005, <http://hc.wharton.upenn.edu/impactconference>

GTZ (2001). Promotion des mutuelles de santé, Rapport de l'étude de faisabilité technique et financière Diourbel/Dakar. From <http://www.gtz.de/health-insurance/download/promotion-des-mutuelles-de-sante-Diourbel.pdf>

Huber, G., J. Hohmann, and K. Reinhard. (n.d). Mutual Health Organization (MHO) – Five Years Experience in West Africa. Concerns, Controversies and Proposed Solutions.

GTZ, Division 4320- Health and Population, Germany. From <http://www.gtz.de/health-insurance/download/GTZ-Westafrika%20MHO-english.pdf>

Forman, L., Pillay, Y. & Sait, L., 2004. Health legislation 1994-2003. South African Health Review 2003/04. Durban: Health Systems Trust.

ILO: 2003-2004. Key Indicators of the Labour Market (Geneva, 2003),
<http://www.ilo.org/kilm>

ILO (2001). Social Security: A new consensus, Geneva

ILO (2001). Social Security: Issues, challenges and prospects, International ILO Labour Conference, 89th Session 2001, Report VI, Geneva)

Jütting, J. (2000). Social Security Systems in Low Income Countries: Concepts, Constraints, and the Need for Cooperation. In: International Social Security Review 53 (4): 3-25.

Jütting, J. (2005). Health Insurance for the Poor in Developing Countries. Burlington: Ashgate.

McIntyre, D.I. & Doherty, J., 2004. Health care financing and expenditure – progress since 1994 and remaining challenges. In Van Rensburg, H.C.J. (ed.). Health and Health Care in South Africa. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Ron, A., Scheil-Adlung, X. (2001), Recent health policy innovations in social security, Geneva.

Scheil-Adlung, X. (2001), Building social security: The challenge of privatization, Geneva

UNDP, 2004. Human Development Report 2004. Washington, D.C.: Oxford University Press.

Wagstaff, A.E., Van Doorslaer, et al, 1992. Equity in the finance of health care : some international comparisons. Journal of health economics 11 (4): 361-88.

Whitehead, M., Dahlgren, G. & Evans, T., 2001. Equity and health sector reforms: can low-income countries escape the medical poverty trap? Lancet 358: 833-836.

WHO (2000). Ministerial Round Table: Health and Poverty. Fifty-first session of Regional Committee, Manila.

WHO, 2004. Distribution of health payments and catastrophic expenditures: Methodology. Health System Financing, Expenditure and Resource Allocation (FER). EIP/WHO, Geneva.

CJL Murray, K Xu, DB Evans, K Kawabata, J Klavus, P Hanvoravongchai, R Zeramdini. (2003): Assessing the distribution of household financial contributions to the health system: concepts and empirical application. Chapter 38 in: CJL Murray, DB Evans, editors. Health Systems Performance Assessment: Debates, Methods and Empiricism. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003.

K Xu, J Klavus, K Kawabata, DB Evans, P Hanvoravongchai, JP Ortiz de Iturbide, R Zeramdini, CJL Murray.(2003): Household health system contributions and capacity to pay: definitional, empirical and technical challenges. Chapter 39 in: CJL Murray, DB Evans, editors. Health Systems Performance Assessment: Debates, Methods and Empiricism. Geneva: World Health Organization.

World Bank, 2004. World Development Indicators Database. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Xu, K., Evans, D.B., Kawabata, K., Zeramdini, R., Klavus, J., Murray, C., 2003. Household catastrophic health expenditure: a multicountry analysis. Lancet 362: 111-117.

Government of Senegal with the Staffs of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Senegal Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, Economic and Financial Policy Framework Paper (1999-2001).

<http://www.imf.org/external/NP/PFP/1999/senegal/INDEX.HTM#VIB>).

WHO. The World Health Report 2005

Himmelstein U D, Warren E, Thorne D, and Woolhandler S. Illness And Injury As Contributors To Bankruptcy. Health Affairs Web Exclusive, February 2, 2005

Kawabata K., Ke Xu & G.Carrin (2002). Preventing impoverishment through protection against catastrophic health expenditure, Bulletin of the World Health Organization, vol.80, no.8,p.612.

A.S.Preker & G.Carrin (eds) (2004). Health Financing for Poor People- Resource mobilization and Risk sharing (Washington, DC: World Bank)

G.Carrin & C.James (2005). Social health insurance: Key factors affecting the transition towards universal coverage. International Social Security Review, 58 (1), pp.45-64.

G.Carrin & C.James (2005). Key performance indicators for the implementation of social health insurance. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy. forthcoming.