

PHC Vital Signs Profile: Indicator Description Sheets

Sri Lanka

List of Indicators

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Context | 3 |
| 1. GDP per capita (PPP current international \$) | 3 |
| 2. Population living in poverty (Under \$1.90 int'l dollars / day)..... | 4 |
| 3. Government health spending as percentage of GDP..... | 5 |
| Outcomes | 6 |
| 4. Life expectancy at birth (years)..... | 6 |
| 5. Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)..... | 7 |
| 6. Neonatal mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)..... | 8 |
| 7. Premature noncommunicable disease (NCD) mortality (probability) | 9 |
| 8. Causes of death..... | 10 |
| Financing | 11 |
| 9. PHC spending per capita (USD)..... | 11 |
| <i>Prioritization of PHC</i> | 12 |
| 10. PHC spending as a share of overall health spending | 12 |
| 11. Government PHC spending as a share of government health spending | 13 |
| <i>Sources of Spending</i> | 14 |
| 12. Government PHC spending as share of current PHC spending..... | 14 |
| Performance | 15 |
| <i>Access</i> | 15 |
| 13. Perceived access barriers due to treatment costs..... | 15 |
| 14. Perceived access barriers due to distance..... | 16 |
| <i>Quality</i> | 17 |
| Comprehensiveness | 17 |
| 15. Average availability of 5 tracer RMNCH services..... | 17 |
| 16. Average availability of services for 3 tracer communicable diseases | 18 |
| 17. Average availability of diagnosis and management of 3 tracer NCDs | 19 |
| Continuity..... | 20 |
| 18. DTP3 dropout rate | 20 |
| 19. Treatment success rate for new TB cases..... | 21 |
| Person-Centeredness | 22 |
| Provider Availability | 22 |
| Provider Competence | 22 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 20. Antenatal care components (%) | 22 |
| 21. Family planning informed users (%) | 23 |
| Safety | 24 |
| 22. Adequate waste disposal | 24 |
| 23. Adequate infection control | 25 |
| <i>Service Coverage</i> | 26 |
| RMNCH | 26 |
| 24. Demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods | 26 |
| 25. Antenatal care coverage (4+ visits) | 27 |
| 26. Coverage of DTP3 immunization | 28 |
| 27. Care-seeking for suspected child pneumonia | 29 |
| Infectious Diseases | 30 |
| 28. TB cases detected and treated with success | 30 |
| 29. People living with HIV receiving anti-retroviral treatment | 31 |
| 30. Children under 5 with diarrhea receiving ORS | 32 |
| Noncommunicable Diseases | 33 |
| 31. % of population with normal blood pressure | 33 |
| Equity | 34 |
| 32. Perceived barriers to care due to treatment costs, by wealth quintile | 34 |
| 33. Coverage of RMNCH services, by mother's education | 35 |
| 34. Under-five mortality rate, by residence | 36 |
| Appendices | 37 |
| <i>Appendix 1: Tracer Items for Waste Disposal</i> | 37 |
| <i>Appendix 2: Tracer Items for Infection Control</i> | 37 |

Context

Context indicators cover important contextual details about a country, including GDP per capita, the proportion of the population living in poverty, and government spending on health.

1. GDP per capita (PPP current international \$)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | GDP per capita, PPP (current international dollars) |
| Short name of indicator | GDP per capita (\$PPP international dollars) |
| Description | Gross domestic product per capita converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. Data are in current international dollars. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Context |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> GDP is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. <i>Denominator:</i> Total population |
| Rationale | GDP per capita is an important contextual indicator that provides information about the average annual income of country residents. |
| Data Source & Year | World Development Indicators (World Bank), 2017. |
| Limitations | GDP as a measure has some limitations including: (1) it doesn't capture non-market production; (2) it doesn't capture underground or non-official economies; (3) it doesn't measure the possible negative effects (e.g. on quality of life or environment of the production captured in the measure; and (4) trending can be difficult due changes in the quality of products and the inclusion of new goods. Additionally, GDP estimates can vary greatly depending on the basket of goods captures and the currency used for reporting. There may be differences in national accounting and demographic reporting procedures and practices between countries. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

2. Population living in poverty (Under \$1.90 int'l dollars / day)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Proportion of population below international poverty line of \$1.90 per day (2011 PPP) |
| Short name of indicator | % Living in poverty |
| Description | Percentage of the population living in poverty, defined as living on less than \$1.90 international dollars per day. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. Data are in constant 2011 international dollars. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Context |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Total population living on less than \$1.90 international dollars per day <i>Denominator:</i> Total population |
| Rationale | Populations living in poverty may face greater barriers to health services access and utilization. |
| Data Source & Year | World Development Indicators (World Bank), 2016. Data are based on primary household survey data obtained from government statistical agencies and World Bank country departments. |
| Limitations | The timeliness, frequency, quality, and comparability of household surveys may be poor, particularly in the poorest countries. The availability and quality of poverty monitoring data remains low in small states, countries with fragile situations, and low-income countries and even some middle-income countries. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

3. Government health spending as percentage of GDP

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Domestic General Government Health Expenditure as % of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) |
| Short name of indicator | Government health spending as % of GDP |
| Description | <p>Domestic General Government Health Expenditure as % of GDP measures current government expenditure on health, from domestic sources, relative to the country's GDP. Domestic General Government Health Expenditure tracks expenditure by all public and compulsory sources for health, exclusively from domestic revenue.</p> <p>The numerator refers to health care goods and services used or consumed during a year. Note that capital investments are excluded.</p> |
| Comparability | Comparable/Standard indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Financing |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> Domestic General Government Health Expenditure</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</p> |
| Rationale | Contributes to understanding overall government expenditure on health in relation to the size of the national economy. |
| Data Source & Year | WHO Global Health Expenditure Database, 2013. |
| Limitations | The indicator value presented may differ from country data sources due to the adoption of methods to enhance international comparability. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Outcomes

Outcomes focus on the health status of the population, including life expectancy, mortality, and causes of death.

4. Life expectancy at birth (years)

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Life expectancy at birth (years) |
| Short name of indicator | Life expectancy |
| Description | The average number of years that a newborn could expect to live if he or she were to pass through life exposed to the sex- and age-specific death rates prevailing at the time of his or her birth, for a specific year, in a given country, territory or geographical area. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Outcomes |
| Construction | Life expectancy at birth is derived from life tables and is based on sex- and age-specific death rates. United Nations values for life expectancy at birth correspond to mid-year estimates, consistent with the corresponding United Nations fertility medium-variant quinquennial population projections. Procedures used to estimate WHO life tables for Member States vary depending on the data available to assess child and adult mortality. |
| Rationale | Life expectancy at birth is one of the key measures of a population's health and is a reflection of the overall mortality level and pattern across all age groups within the population. |
| Data Source & Year | Global Health Observatory (GHO), 2016. Data on maternal mortality and other relevant variables are obtained through databases maintained by WHO, UNPD, UNICEF, and the World Bank. Data available from countries vary in terms of the source and methods. Given the variability of the sources of data, different methods are used for each data source in order to arrive at country estimates that are comparable and permit regional and global aggregation. |
| Limitations | The lack of complete and reliable mortality data, especially for low income countries and particularly on mortality among adults and the elderly, necessitates the application of modelling (based on data from other populations) to estimate life expectancy. This may lead to minor differences compared with official life tables prepared by Member States. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

5. Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births) |
| Short name of indicator | Maternal mortality ratio |
| Description | The annual number of female deaths from any cause related to or aggravated by pregnancy or its management (excluding accidental or incidental causes) during pregnancy and childbirth or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and site of the pregnancy, expressed per 100,000 live births, for a specified time period. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Outcomes |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of maternal deaths <i>Denominator:</i> Number of live births (expressed per 100,000 live births) |
| Rationale | Complications during pregnancy and childbirth are a leading cause of death and disability among women of reproductive age in developing countries. The maternal mortality ratio represents the obstetric risk associated with each pregnancy and monitors deaths related to pregnancy and childbirth. It reflects the capacity of the health system to provide effective health care in preventing and addressing the complications occurring during pregnancy and childbirth that can result in maternal death. |
| Data Source & Year | Global Health Observatory (GHO), 2015. Data on maternal mortality and other relevant variables are obtained through databases maintained by WHO, UNPD, UNICEF, and the World Bank. Data available from countries vary in terms of the source and methods. Given the variability of the sources of data, different methods are used for each data source in order to arrive at country estimates that are comparable and permit regional and global aggregation. |
| Limitations | Vital registration and health information systems in most developing countries are weak and thus cannot provide an accurate assessment of maternal mortality. Even estimates derived from complete vital registration systems, such as those in developed countries, suffer from misclassification and underreporting of maternal deaths. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

6. Neonatal mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Neonatal mortality rate (probability of dying within the first 28 days of life per 1,000 live births) |
| Short name of indicator | Neonatal mortality rate |
| Description | The neonatal mortality rate is the probability of a newborn dying before reaching 28 days of age, expressed per 1,000 live births. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Outcomes |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of deaths of neonates at ages 0-28 days <i>Denominator:</i> Number of live births for a specified year (expressed per 1,000 live births) |
| Rationale | Mortality during the neonatal period accounts for a large proportion of child deaths and is considered to be a useful indicator of maternal and newborn neonatal health care. Neonatal mortality rate is a Sustainable Development Goal Indicator for monitoring child health. |
| Data Source & Year | UN IGME, 2015. The Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality of Estimation, which includes representatives from UNICEF, WHO, the World Bank and the United Nations Population Division, produces trends of neonatal mortality with standardized methodology by group of countries depending on the type and quality of source of data available. These neonatal rates are estimates, derived from the estimated UN IGME neonatal rate and infant population from World Population Prospects to calculate the live births; hence they are not necessarily the same as the official national statistics. |
| Limitations | The reliability of estimates of neonatal mortality depends on the accuracy and completeness of reporting and recording of births and deaths. Underreporting and misclassification are common. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

7. Premature noncommunicable disease (NCD) mortality (probability)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Mortality between ages 30 and 70 years from cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory diseases (probability) |
| Short name of indicator | Premature NCD mortality |
| Description | Probability of dying between the ages of 30 and 70 years from non-communicable diseases, defined as the percent of 30-year-old-people who would die before their 70th birthday from cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease, assuming that s/he would experience current mortality rates at every age and s/he would not die from any other cause of death. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Outcomes |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of deaths between ages 30 to 70 years from cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease in a synthetic life table population. <i>Denominator:</i> Population at exact age 30 in the synthetic life table population. |
| Rationale | Non-communicable diseases account for an increasing proportion of morbidity and mortality in many countries. Prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of these diseases to avoid premature mortality are a critical part of primary health care. |
| Data Source & Year | Global Health Observatory (GHO), 2016. Data are derived from re-analysis of Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) micro-data, which are publicly available using the standard indicator definitions as published in DHS documentation. |
| Limitations | The reliability of estimates depends on the accuracy and completeness of reporting and recording of births and deaths. Underreporting and misclassification are common. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

8. Causes of death

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Cause-specific mortality |
| Short name of indicator | Causes of death |
| Description | Causes of death disaggregated by percentage attributable to non-communicable diseases (NCDs), injuries, and communicable and other conditions (including maternal, perinatal, and nutritional conditions). |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Outcomes |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Total number of deaths by cause in a given year <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of deaths in a given year |
| Rationale | Cause-of-death statistics allow governments to determine priorities for public health actions, such as increasing health spending in areas to which high mortality is attributed. |
| Data Source & Year | Global Health Observatory (GHO), 2016. Data are derived from re-analysis of Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) micro-data, which are publicly available using the standard indicator definitions as published in DHS documentation. |
| Limitations | The reliability of estimates depends on the accuracy and completeness of reporting and recording of births and deaths. Underreporting and misclassification are common. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Financing

Financing includes measurements of per capita expenditures on Primary Health Care (PHC), share of health expenditure allocated to PHC, and health expenditures as percent of GDP.

9. PHC spending per capita (USD)

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Current primary health care (PHC) expenditure per capita (USD) |
| Short name of indicator | PHC spending per capita |
| Description | <p>Primary Health Care (PHC) expenditure monitors current health expenditure on a given set of health services defined within the System of Health Accounts 2011 (SHA 2011) framework. This includes government and non-government expenditures. The selected subset of health services includes general outpatient care, dental care, home-based curative care, outpatient and home-based long-term care, and preventive care (IEC, immunisation, early disease detection, healthy condition monitoring, disease control programme)¹. To this subset of health services are added medical goods (medicines, glasses, hearing aids)¹. Note that capital investments are excluded.</p> <p>Current primary health care expenditure is converted into USD and divided by population to derive a per capita USD estimate of spending.</p> |
| Comparability | Comparable/Standard indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Financing |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> Current PHC Expenditure in USD</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Population</p> |
| Rationale | Captures the level of expenditure on PHC |
| Data Source & Year | Estimated by WHO using country published health accounts from 2013, following the SHA 2011 global standard. |
| Limitations | This indicator includes expenditure on medical goods that may be serving other services than primary health care services. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

¹For more information, refer to the System of Health Accounts 2011.

Prioritization of PHC

10. PHC spending as a share of overall health spending

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Current PHC expenditure as % of Current Health Expenditure |
| Short name of indicator | PHC spending as % of CHE |
| Description | <p>Primary Health Care (PHC) expenditure monitors current health expenditure on a given set of health services defined within the System of Health Accounts 2011 (SHA 2011) framework. This includes government and non-government expenditures. The selected subset of health services includes general outpatient care, dental care, home-based curative care, outpatient and home-based long-term care, and preventive care (IEC, immunisation, early disease detection, healthy condition monitoring, disease control programme)². To this subset of health services are added medical goods (medicines, glasses, hearing aids)¹. Note that capital investments are excluded.</p> <p>Current health expenditure (CHE) refers to all health care goods and services used or consumed during a year by residents of a country. Note that capital investments are excluded.</p> |
| Comparability | Comparable/Standard indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Financing |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> Current Primary Health Care Expenditure</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Current Health Expenditure</p> |
| Rationale | PHC expenditure in relation to current health expenditure |
| Data Source & Year | Estimated by WHO using country published health accounts from 2013, following the SHA 2011 global standard. |
| Limitations | This indicator includes expenditure on medical goods that may be serving other services than primary health care services. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

² For more information, refer to the System of Health Accounts 2011

11. Government PHC spending as a share of government health spending

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Domestic General Government PHC Expenditure as a % of Domestic General Government Health Expenditure |
| Short name of indicator | Share of domestic government health spending allocated to PHC |
| Description | <p>Domestic General Government Health Expenditure on PHC tracks current expenditure by all domestic public and compulsory sources on PHC. PHC expenditure includes general outpatient care, dental care, home-based curative care, outpatient and home-based long-term care, and preventive care (IEC, immunisation, early disease detection, healthy condition monitoring, disease control programme)³. To this subset of health services are added medical goods (medicines, glasses, hearing aids)¹. Note that capital investments are excluded.</p> <p>Domestic General Government Health Expenditure tracks current expenditure by all public and compulsory sources for health, exclusively from domestic revenue. The indicator refers to health care goods and services used or consumed during a year. Note that capital investments are excluded.</p> |
| Comparability | Comparable/Standard indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Financing |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> Domestic General Government PHC Expenditure</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Domestic General Government Health Expenditure</p> |
| Rationale | Contributes to understanding government prioritization towards PHC within the health sector. |
| Data Source & Year | Estimated by WHO using country published health accounts from 2013, following the SHA 2011 global standard. |
| Limitations | This indicator includes expenditure on medical goods that may be serving other services than primary health care services. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

³ For more information, refer to the System of Health Accounts 2011

Sources of Spending

12. Government PHC spending as share of current PHC spending

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Domestic General Government PHC Expenditure as % of Current Primary Health Care (PHC) Expenditure |
| Short name of indicator | Domestic government PHC spending as % of current PHC spending |
| Description | Government PHC expenditure tracks current expenditure by all domestic public and compulsory sources on PHC. The denominator, current PHC expenditure, includes government, non-government, and private sector sources of PHC spending (including household out-of-pocket spending). Current PHC expenditure includes general outpatient care, dental care, home-based curative care, outpatient and home-based long-term care, and preventive care (IEC, immunisation, early disease detection, healthy condition monitoring, disease control programme). To this subset of health services are added medical goods (medicines, glasses, hearing aids) ¹ . Note that capital investments are excluded. |
| Comparability | Comparable/Standard indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Financing |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Domestic General Government Health Expenditure on Primary Health Care <i>Denominator:</i> Current Primary Health Care Expenditure |
| Rationale | This indicator reflects the share of domestic government expenditure in total PHC expenditure. This measure indicates government commitment to primary health care. |
| Data Source & Year | Estimated by WHO using country published health accounts from 2013, following the SHA 2011 global standard. |
| Limitations | Currently, it is not feasible to distinguish among non-governmental sources of PHC expenditure, such as out-of-pocket household expenditures on PHC. This indicator includes expenditure on medical goods that may be serving other services than primary health care services. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Performance

The Performance domain includes measures of access, quality, and service coverage.

Where comparable data are available, scores for the Performance domain are color-coded green (good, 80+), yellow (medium, 60-79), or red (poor, <60). Scores based on data from non-comparable sources are colored gray.

Access

Access includes measurements of financial barriers and geographic hardship due to distance.

13. Perceived access barriers due to treatment costs

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Perceived barriers to accessing care due to treatment costs |
| Short name of indicator | Perceived access barriers due to treatment costs |
| Description | Access barriers due to treatment cost measures the percent of women who self-report problems in accessing health care due to cost of treatment. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Access |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of women who report specific problems in accessing health care when they are sick due to issues related to getting money for treatment <i>Denominator:</i> Number of women interviewed |
| Rationale | This indicator reflects user-reported access barriers and is a complement to measurement of overall out-of-pocket expenditures on health. Financial access is a critical component of health services access, and access barriers due to cost can have detrimental effects on the utilization and effectiveness of health services. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2007. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. Data were accessed from the DHS STATcompiler which may, in some cases, differ slightly from the results reported in the country's DHS report. |
| Limitations | This indicator captures access barriers due to treatment costs, but it may not capture financial barriers to access that are related to transport or medicines required following diagnosis. Results are taken from surveys and as a result are subject to recall bias and limitations due to survey design. Note that this variable relies on perceived, rather than actual costs. |
| VSP Methodology | For calculation of summary scores in the VSP, this variable was transformed by subtracting the value from 100. |

14. Perceived access barriers due to distance

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Perceived barriers to accessing care due to distance |
| Short name of indicator | Perceived access barriers due to distance |
| Description | Access barriers due to distance measures the percent of women who self-report that the distance they have to travel to receive medical advice or treatment is a big problem. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Access |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of women who report the distance to the health facility as a big problem in getting medical advice or treatment when sick <i>Denominator:</i> Number of women interviewed |
| Rationale | This indicator reflects user-reported geographic access barriers complements measures of other barriers to access. Geographic access is a critical component of health services access, and extensive distance traveled to receive treatment can have detrimental effects on the utilization and effectiveness of health services. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2007. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. Data were accessed from the DHS STATcompiler which may, in some cases, differ slightly from the results reported in the country's DHS report. |
| Limitations | This indicator captures access barriers due to need to travel for care, but depending on how questions are asked, it may not capture barriers to access that are related to cost of transport or travel to obtain medicines required following diagnosis. |
| VSP Methodology | For calculation of summary scores in the VSP, this variable was transformed by subtracting the value from 100. |

Quality

Quality of care measures are focused on principles that are proven to impact the quality of PHC service delivery at the point of care. These include comprehensiveness of care, continuity of care, person-centeredness, availability and competence of providers, and safety practices.

Comprehensiveness

15. Average availability of 5 tracer RMNCH services

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Average availability of tracer RMNCH services (family planning, ANC, PMTCT, routine child immunization, and curative care for children under five) |
| Short name of indicator | Average availability of 5 tracer RMNCH services |
| Description | Proportion of maternal and child health services provided and for which guidelines are available (sick child, vaccination, family planning, antenatal care, and prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV) across all facilities. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Comprehensiveness |
| Construction | Weighted average of the percentage of five maternal and child health services (child, vaccination, family planning, antenatal care, and prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV) provided at each facility surveyed. |
| Rationale | Maternal and child health services are a critical part of primary health care and must be widely available throughout all facilities in order to support maternal and child health. |
| Data Source & Year | Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA), 2017. SARA is a health facility assessment tool designed to assess and monitor the service availability and readiness of the health sector and to generate evidence to support the planning and managing of a health system. SARA is designed as a systematic survey to generate a set of tracer indicators of service availability and readiness. |
| Limitations | While this indicator provides information on the extent to which maternal and child health services are offered, it does not fully assess the readiness of facilities to provide care that follows evidence-based practices, or the quality of the care itself. Use of an indicator reflecting questions related to assessing service readiness would provide additional information. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

16. Average availability of services for 3 tracer communicable diseases

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Average availability of tracer communicable disease services (HIV, STI, and TB) |
| Short name of indicator | Average availability of services for 3 tracer communicable diseases |
| Description | Proportion of infectious diseases services provided and for which guidelines are available for sexually transmitted infections, tuberculosis, and HIV across all facilities. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Comprehensiveness |
| Construction | Weighted average of the percentage of service for three tracer communicable diseases (HIV, STI, and HIV) provided at each facility surveyed. |
| Rationale | Populations must have adequate access to services that support prevention, diagnosis and treatment of infectious diseases. If few facilities offer these services, access to needed care is compromised. |
| Data Source & Year | Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA), 2017. SARA is a health facility assessment tool designed to assess and monitor the service availability and readiness of the health sector and to generate evidence to support the planning and managing of a health system. SARA is designed as a systematic survey to generate a set of tracer indicators of service availability and readiness. |
| Limitations | As defined, this indicator does not include services for malaria. Malaria could be added in for select countries, depending on the extent to which the service is required. While this indicator provides information on the extent to which infectious disease services are provided, it does not fully assess the readiness of facilities to provide care that follows evidence-based practices, or the quality of the care itself. Use of an indicator reflecting questions related to assessing service readiness would provide additional information. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

17. Average availability of diagnosis and management of 3 tracer NCDs

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Average availability of tracer noncommunicable disease diagnosis and management (diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, and chronic cardiovascular disease) |
| Short name of indicator | Average availability of diagnosis and management of 3 tracer NCDs |
| Description | Proportion of non-combinable disease services provided and for which guidelines are available (diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, and chronic cardiovascular disease) across all facilities. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Comprehensiveness |
| Construction | Weighted average of the percentage of diagnosis and management services for three tracer NCDs (diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, and chronic cardiovascular disease) provided at each facility surveyed. |
| Rationale | Non-communicable diseases account for an increasing proportion of morbidity and mortality in many countries. Diagnosis and treatment of these diseases are a critical part of primary health care and must be widely available throughout all facilities in order to support the health of the population. |
| Data Source & Year | Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA), 2017. SARA is a health facility assessment tool designed to assess and monitor the service availability and readiness of the health sector and to generate evidence to support the planning and managing of a health system. SARA is designed as a systematic survey to generate a set of tracer indicators of service availability and readiness. |
| Limitations | While this indicator provides information on the extent to which NCD services are offered, it does not fully assess the readiness of facilities to provide care that follows evidence-based practices, or the quality of the care itself. Use of an indicator reflecting questions related to assessing service readiness would provide additional information. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

18. DTP3 dropout rate

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Dropout rate between 1 st and 3 rd DTP vaccination |
| Short name of indicator | DTP3 dropout rate |
| Description | Diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis (DTP) dropout rate is the percent of children who do not receive the full three doses of DTP vaccination after receiving the initial dose. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Continuity |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> [DTP1 Immunization Coverage - DTP3 Immunization Coverage] <i>Denominator:</i> DTP1 Immunization Coverage |
| Rationale | Immunization is an essential component for reducing under-five mortality. Immunization coverage estimates are used to monitor coverage of immunization services and to guide disease eradication and elimination efforts. Measuring the gap between DTP1 and DTP3 reflects continuity within a health system, including the system's ability to capture and follow up with patients. |
| Data Source & Year | WHO/UNICEF, 2017. The WHO and UNICEF regularly report and release updated immunization coverage data related to the Global Vaccine Action Plan. |
| Limitations | Given the prevalence of global support for immunization efforts, a high coverage rate of DTP3 immunization may be reflective of strong support from vertical programming in some countries. As such, DTP3 coverage alone is not necessarily a proxy for primary care health system performance. |
| VSP Methodology | For calculation of summary scores in the VSP, this variable was transformed by subtracting the value from 100. |

19. Treatment success rate for new TB cases

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Tuberculosis cases detected and treated with success |
| Short name of indicator | Treatment success rate for new TB cases |
| Description | Percentage of tuberculosis (TB) cases successfully treated (cured plus treatment completed) among TB cases notified to national health authorities during a specified period, usually one year. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Continuity |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of TB cases registered in a specified time period that were successfully treated with or without bacteriological evidence of success <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of TB cases registered in the same period |
| Rationale | Treatment success is an indicator of the performance of national TB programs. It also serves as a proxy for a number of aspects of successful service delivery within a health system, including diagnostic and treatment accuracy and the system's ability to capture and follow up with patients over time. |
| Data Source & Year | WHO TB Programme, 2015. Preferred data sources include patient record and surveillance systems. |
| Limitations | This indicator measures only public-sector TB programs and does not include results from private-sector treatment programs or facilities. Therefore, in countries with strong private-sector TB programs, these results do not reflect the totality of the TB treatment success rate. Further, this indicator does not capture the system's ability to identify new TB patients. As a result, a country could perform well on this indicator, but poorly on the identification of new TB cases. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Person-Centeredness

No recent indicator available from international or national data sources.

Provider Availability

No recent indicator available from international or national data sources.

Provider Competence

20. Antenatal care components (%)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full name of indicator | Antenatal care components |
| Short name of indicator | Antenatal care components |
| Description | Percentage of pregnant women that during antenatal care control (ANC) received the following components of an ANC visit: blood pressure measured, urine sample taken, blood sample taken, iron pills or capsules, intestinal parasite drugs. |
| Comparability | Non-comparable / Country-specific proxy indicator for antenatal care quality score |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Provider competence |
| Construction | <i>Average percentage of pregnant women that, according to DHS 2016 report, received the following components of an ANC visit: blood pressure measured, urine sample taken, blood sample taken, iron pills or capsules, or intestinal parasite drugs.</i> |
| Rationale | ANC is an essential activity for reducing maternal and child mortality. Although a specific survey for the quality of ANC is not available, data from DHS 2016 provided information about certain quality technical items of an ANC visit. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2016. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. |
| Limitations | Not all aspects of a good quality ANC are covered. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

21. Family planning informed users (%)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full name of indicator | Family planning informed users |
| Short name of indicator | Family planning informed users |
| Description | Percentage of women who were informed about side effects or problems of method used, what to do if experienced side effects, or informed about other methods that could be used. |
| Comparability | Non-comparable / Country-specific proxy indicator for family planning quality score |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Provider competence |
| Construction | <i>Average of percentage of women that, according to DHS 2016 report, were informed about side effects or problems of method used, what to do if experienced side effects, or informed about other methods that could be used.</i> |
| Rationale | A family planning visit has several quality technical items. One quality item is connected to providing counseling and information to users. DHS 2016 provides information on this item that was used to create a proxy. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2016. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. |
| Limitations | Not all quality elements of family planning were captured. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Safety

22. Adequate waste disposal

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Adequate waste disposal system in place |
| Short name of indicator | Adequate waste disposal |
| Description | Average score (out of 3) on adherence to standards for disposing of medical and hazardous waste, sharps, and having guidelines for waste disposal in place. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Safety |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Total of the average number of the 3 waste disposal tracer items in place in a facility <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of facilities See Appendix 1 for a list of waste disposal tracer items. |
| Rationale | Good waste control practices are required to support infection control and as well as the safety of both health workers and staff and clients. |
| Data Source & Year | Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA), 2017. SARA is a health facility assessment tool designed to assess and monitor the service availability and readiness of the health sector and to generate evidence to support the planning and managing of a health system. SARA is designed as a systematic survey to generate a set of tracer indicators of service availability and readiness. |
| Limitations | The indicator conveys the extent to which waste disposal tracer items are present, but it does not indicate how well health workers adhere to infection control practices—for example, whether the posted guidelines are followed or if sharps are always disposed in the designated place/manner. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

23. Adequate infection control

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Proportion of clinic rooms with all control items |
| Short name of indicator | Adequate infection control |
| Description | Proportion of rooms (family planning, sick child, antenatal care, and non-communicable disease) where all infection control tracer items are present. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Quality / Safety |
| Construction | See Appendix 2 for a list of infection control tracer items. <i>Numerator:</i> Number of rooms where all the infection control tracer items were observed <i>Denominator:</i> Total number of rooms observed |
| Rationale | Adequate infection control practices are a key element in protecting both health workers and clients from the transmission of infection. The list of infection control items included in this indicator forms a basic foundation for infection control in the health facility setting. |
| Data Source & Year | Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA), 2017. SARA is a health facility assessment tool designed to assess and monitor the service availability and readiness of the health sector and to generate evidence to support the planning and managing of a health system. SARA is designed as a systematic survey to generate a set of tracer indicators of service availability and readiness. |
| Limitations | The indicator conveys the extent to which infection control items are present, but it does not indicate how well health workers adhere to infection control practices—for example, whether they use soap and water to wash their hands, wear gloves, or disinfect surfaces. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Service Coverage

Coverage looks at the effective application of a broad range of PHC-focused clinical services for the population in need of such services.

RMNCH

24. Demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Demand satisfied with modern methods among women 15-49 years who are married or in a union (%) |
| Short name of indicator | Demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods |
| Description | Proportion of married or in-union women of reproductive age (aged 15-49 years) who are married or in a union and have their need for family planning satisfied with modern methods. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / RMNCH |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> Number of married or in-union women of reproductive age (15–49 years old) who are currently using, or whose sexual partner is currently using, at least one modern contraceptive method</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total demand for family planning (the sum of contraceptive prevalence (any method) and the unmet need for family planning)</p> |
| Rationale | Use of modern contraception is a critical component of women’s, maternal, and population health. This indicator serves as a proxy for population access to reproductive health services, particularly women’s access, which are frequently delivered through the primary health care system and are essential for meeting many health targets. This is SDG indicator 3.7.1. |
| Data Source & Year | Taken from joint World Bank/WHO “Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report” based on imputed value from 2015 regional average. Data are sourced from UNPD estimates based on household surveys, including Demographic and Health Survey (DHS). DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. |
| Limitations | In some surveys, the lack of probing questions, asked to ensure that the respondent understands the meaning of the different contraceptive methods, can result in an underestimation of contraceptive prevalence. Sampling variability may be an issue, particularly when contraceptive prevalence, modern methods is measured for a specific subgroup (according to method, age-group, level of educational attainment, place of residence, etc.) or when analyzing trends over time. This indicator is a measure of both service coverage and fertility preferences and, as such, no target exists. This indicator also specifically addresses only those women who are married or in a union, and may fail to account for any barriers to access encountered by those women who are not but may still desire or benefit from contraception. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

25. Antenatal care coverage (4+ visits)

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Antenatal care coverage, four or more visits (ANC4) (%) |
| Short name of indicator | Antenatal care coverage (4+ visits) |
| Description | Antenatal care coverage (4+) visits is the percent of women with a live birth who received antenatal care (ANC) 4 or more times. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / RMNCH |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> The number of women aged 15-49 surveyed with a live birth in a given time period who received antenatal care four or more times from any provider</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of women aged 15-49 with a live birth in the same period</p> |
| Rationale | Antenatal care coverage is an indicator of access and use of health care during pregnancy. The antenatal period presents opportunities for reaching pregnant women with interventions that may be vital to their health and wellbeing and that of their infants. Receiving antenatal care at least four times, as recommended by WHO, increases the likelihood of receiving effective maternal health interventions during antenatal visits. |
| Data Source & Year | Taken from joint World Bank/WHO "Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report" based on data from 2004. Data are sourced from the WHO/RHR global database, which compiles empirical data from DHS, MICS and other national household surveys. Available survey data on this indicator usually do not specify the type of provider; therefore, in general, receipt of care by any provider is measured. At the global level, data from facility reporting are not used. Before data are included into the global databases, UNICEF undertakes a process of data verification that includes correspondence with field offices to clarify any questions regarding estimates. |
| Limitations | Receiving antenatal care during pregnancy does not guarantee the receipt of interventions that are effective in improving maternal health (effective coverage). Although the indicator for "at least one visit" refers to visits with skilled health providers (doctor, nurse, or midwife), "four or more visits" usually measures visits with any provider because national-level household surveys do not collect provider data for each visit. In addition, standardization of the definition of skilled health personnel is sometimes difficult because of differences in training of health personnel in different countries (UNICEF). Recall error is a potential source of bias in the data. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

26. Coverage of DTP3 immunization

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | One-year-old children who have received 3 doses of diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine (DTP3), (%) |
| Short name of indicator | Coverage of DTP3 immunization |
| Description | Diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis (DTP) coverage measures the percent of one-year-olds who have received three doses of the combined diphtheria, tetanus toxoid and pertussis vaccine in a given year. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / RMNCH |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of children of aged 12 months surveyed who have received three doses of the combined diphtheria, tetanus toxoid and pertussis vaccine in a given year <i>Denominator:</i> Total population of children aged 12 months surveyed |
| Rationale | Immunization is an essential component for reducing under-five mortality. Immunization coverage estimates are used to monitor coverage of immunization services and to guide disease eradication and elimination efforts. |
| Data Source & Year | Taken from joint World Bank/WHO "Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report" based on data from 2015. The WHO and UNICEF regularly report and release updated immunization coverage data related to the Global Vaccine Action Plan. Data are based on country reported administrative data and household surveys. |
| Limitations | Given the prevalence of global support for immunization efforts, a high coverage rate of DTP3 immunization may be reflective of strong support from vertical programming in some countries. As such, DTP3 coverage alone is not necessarily a proxy for health system performance. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

27. Care-seeking for suspected child pneumonia

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Care-seeking behavior for children with suspected pneumonia (%) |
| Short name of indicator | Care-seeking for suspected child pneumonia |
| Description | Percentage of children under 5 years of age with suspected pneumonia (cough and difficulty breathing NOT due to a problem in the chest and a blocked nose) in the two weeks preceding the survey taken to an appropriate health facility or provider. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / RMNCH |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of children (0-59 months) with suspected pneumonia in the two weeks preceding the survey taken to an appropriate health provider <i>Denominator:</i> Number of children (0-59 months) with suspected pneumonia in the two weeks preceding the survey |
| Rationale | Pneumonia is a leading cause of child illness and mortality. The strategy for ending preventable child deaths from pneumonia and diarrhea includes a focus on encouraging appropriate care seeking, a key link to receiving appropriate treatment. A number of strategies and programmes to improve care seeking have been developed and implemented in a number of countries. |
| Data Source & Year | Taken from joint World Bank/WHO "Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report" based on data from 2006. Data are sourced from the UNICEF global database from Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). |
| Limitations | Results are taken from surveys and as a result are subject to recall bias and limitations due to survey design. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

28. TB cases detected and treated with success

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Tuberculosis cases detected and treated with success (%) |
| Short name of indicator | Tuberculosis cases detected and treated with success |
| Description | Number of new and relapse cases of tuberculosis (TB) that were notified and treated successfully in a given year, divided by the estimated number of incident TB cases in the same year, expressed as a percentage. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / Infectious Diseases |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of new and relapse cases notified and treated in a given year <i>Denominator:</i> Number of estimated incident cases in the same year |
| Rationale | This indicator combines case detection rate with treatment success rate to estimate how well the system is detecting and successfully treating TB cases. Treatment success is an indicator of the performance of national TB programs. It also serves as a proxy for a number of aspects of successful service delivery within a health system, including diagnostic and treatment accuracy and the system’s ability to capture and follow up with patients. |
| Data Source & Year | Taken from joint World Bank/WHO “Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report” based on data from 2014. Estimates of TB incidence are produced through a consultative and analytical process led by WHO and are published annually. These estimates are based on annual case notifications, assessments of the quality and coverage of TB notification data, national surveys of the prevalence of TB disease, and information from death (vital) registration systems. Estimates of incidence for each country are derived, using one or more of the following approaches depending on available data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. incidence = case notifications/estimated proportion of cases detected; 2. incidence = prevalence/duration of condition; 3. incidence = deaths/proportion of incident cases that die. <p>These estimates of TB incidence are combined with country-reported data on the number of cases detected and treated, and the percentage of cases successfully treated, as described above.</p> |
| Limitations | The proposed data source for this indicator measures only public sector TB programs and does not include results from private-sector treatment programs or facilities. Therefore, in countries with strong private-sector TB programs, the results do not reflect the totality of the TB treatment success rate. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

29. People living with HIV receiving anti-retroviral treatment

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | People living with HIV receiving Antiretroviral Therapy (ART) (%) |
| Short name of indicator | People living with HIV receiving anti-retroviral treatment |
| Description | Percentage of people living with HIV currently receiving antiretroviral therapy (ART) among the estimated number of adults and children living with HIV. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / Infectious Diseases |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of adults and children who are currently receiving ART at the end of the reporting period <i>Denominator:</i> Estimated number of adults and children living with HIV |
| Rationale | ART has been shown to reduce HIV-related morbidity and mortality among people living with HIV and to reduce transmission of HIV. Effective provision of ART can be a marker of how well a health system reaches marginalized populations with higher HIV prevalence. |
| Data Source & Year | Taken from joint World Bank/WHO "Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report" based on data from 2015. Data are sourced from WHO/UNAIDS estimates. Data on receipt of ART can be collected from facility-based ART registers or drug supply management systems. To estimate the denominator, a standard modelling HIV estimation method, such as in the Spectrum model, is recommended. |
| Limitations | The indicator permits monitoring trends in coverage but does not attempt to distinguish between different forms of antiretroviral therapy or to measure the cost, quality or effectiveness of, or adherence to the treatment regimen provided. These will each vary within and between countries and are liable to change over time. The indicator measures the number of people provided with medication but does not measure whether the individual took the medication thus it is not a measure of adherence. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

30. Children under 5 with diarrhea receiving ORS

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Treatment of diarrhea: Oral rehydration solution (ORS) |
| Short name of indicator | Children under 5 with diarrhea receiving ORS |
| Description | The percent of children with diarrhea, a leading cause of death in children under five, who received appropriate treatment with oral rehydration solution. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / Infectious Diseases |
| Construction | <p><i>Numerator:</i> Number of children under 5 years of age with diarrhoea in the two weeks preceding the survey given fluid from ORS packets or pre-packaged ORS fluids and zinc supplement</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Total number of children aged 0–59 months with diarrhea in the two weeks prior to the survey</p> |
| Rationale | Diarrhea is a leading cause of child illness and mortality. This is an important indicator of access to health commodities and effective treatment of a common cause of child mortality. This indicator reflects trust in the primary health care system, access to facilities, availability of common home treatments, and health knowledge and behavior. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2016. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. Data were accessed from the DHS STATcompiler which may, in some cases, differ slightly from the results reported in the country's DHS report. |
| Limitations | <p>This indicator does not reflect whether oral rehydration salts and continued feeding were given appropriately. Most diarrhea-related deaths are due to dehydration, and many of these deaths can be prevented with the use of oral rehydration salts at home. However, recommendations for the use of oral rehydration therapy have changed over time based on scientific progress, so it is difficult to accurately compare use rates across countries. Until the current recommended method for home management of diarrhea is adopted and applied in all countries, the data should be used with caution.</p> <p>The prevalence of diarrhea may vary by season. Since country surveys are administered at different times, data comparability is further affected.</p> |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |

Noncommunicable Diseases

31. % of population with normal blood pressure

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Age standardized prevalence of normal blood pressure, regardless of treatment status (%) |
| Short name of indicator | % of population with normal blood pressure |
| Description | Age-standardized prevalence of raised blood pressure among persons aged 18+ years (defined as systolic blood pressure \geq 140 mmHg and/or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90 mmHg), and mean systolic blood pressure. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Performance / Coverage / NCDs |
| Construction | <i>Numerator:</i> Number of respondents with systolic blood pressure \geq 140mmHg or diastolic blood pressure \geq 90mmHg <i>Denominator:</i> All survey respondents with a valid measurement |
| Rationale | Hypertension is a leading risk factor for cardiovascular disease. The results for this indicator represent effective coverage for hypertension, a core part of management of NCDs to reduce complications including renal and cardiovascular disease. This indicator represents a proxy for effective health promotion and service coverage. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2016. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. The STEPwise approach to non-communicable disease risk factor surveillance (STEPS) focuses on obtaining core data at each level on the established risk factors that determine the major disease burden. It is based on survey data and may be supplemented by physical and biometric data. |
| Limitations | The defined adult population age range differs by country. |
| VSP Methodology | The percentage of the adult population with normal blood pressure is based on age-standardized estimates. These distributions are rescaled to provide finer resolution for the index, based on the observed minima across countries. The rescaled indicator = $(X-50)/(100-50)*100$, where X is the prevalence of normal blood pressure. |

Equity

Equity in health service delivery and health outcomes is determined through measures that compare coverage, access and outcome measures across different population groups such as education levels, income, or place of residence.

Where comparable data are available, scores for the Equity domain are color-coded based on the difference between values to reflect good (green), medium (yellow), and poor (red). Scores based on data from non-comparable sources are colored gray.

32. Perceived barriers to care due to treatment costs, by wealth quintile

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Full Name of Indicator | Perceived barriers to care due to treatment costs: difference between richest wealth quintile and lowest wealth quintile |
| Short name of indicator | Perceived barriers to care due to treatment costs, by wealth quintile |
| Description | Difference in perceived access barriers due to cost for women of the fifth (highest) income quintile versus those of the first (lowest) income quintile. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Equity / Access |
| Construction | This indicator is disaggregated by wealth quintile. <i>Numerator:</i> Number of women who report specific problems in accessing health care when they are sick due to issues related to getting money for treatment <i>Denominator:</i> Number of women interviewed |
| Rationale | Financial access is a critical component of health services access, and access barriers due to cost can have detrimental effects on the utilization and effectiveness of health services. Achieving equitable access to health care across income groups is an essential goal of primary health care. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2007. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. Data were accessed from the DHS STATcompiler which may, in some cases, differ slightly from the results reported in the country's DHS report. |
| Limitations | This indicator captures access barriers due to treatment costs, but it may not capture financial barriers to access that are related to transport or medicines required following diagnosis. Results are taken from surveys and as a result are subject to recall bias and limitations due to survey design. Note that this variable relies on perceived, rather than actual costs. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |
| Indicator cut points | Access: Difference between highest and lowest wealth quintiles Red > 50 Yellow 5-50 Green ≤ 5 |

33. Coverage of RMNCH services, by mother's education

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Coverage of RMNCH services: difference between at least secondary education and no education |
| Short name of indicator | Coverage of RMNCH services, by mother's education |
| Description | Difference in RMNCH coverage index for households with mothers that have completed secondary level education versus those without secondary level education. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Equity / Coverage |
| Construction | Weighted score of eight RMNCH interventions, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demand for family planning satisfied (modern methods); 2. Antenatal care coverage (at least four visits); 3. Births attended by skilled health personnel; 4. BCG immunization coverage among one-year-olds; 5. Measles immunization coverage among one-year-olds; 6. DTP3 immunization coverage among one-year-olds; 7. Children aged less than five years with diarrhoea receiving oral rehydration therapy and continued feeding; and 8. Children aged less than five years with pneumonia symptoms taken to a health facility - disaggregated by mother's education. |
| Rationale | Achieving equitable coverage of basic services is a goal of primary health care. |
| Data Source & Year | Health Equity Monitor, 2016. Data are based on DHS and MICS. |
| Limitations | Results are taken from surveys and as a result are subject to recall bias and limitations due to survey design. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |
| Indicator cut points | Coverage: Difference between none and secondary education Red > 30 Yellow 3-30 Green ≤ 3 |

34. Under-five mortality rate, by residence

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Full Name of Indicator | Under-five mortality rate: difference between urban and rural residence |
| Short name of indicator | Under-five mortality rate, by residence |
| Description | Difference in under 5 mortality rates between residents of urban areas and rural areas. Probability (expressed as a rate per 1000 live births) of a child born in a specific year or period dying before reaching the age of five years, if subject to age-specific mortality rates of that period. |
| Comparability | Comparable / Standard Indicator |
| VSP Domain and Sub-Domain | Equity / Mortality |
| Construction | This indicator is disaggregated by place of residence (urban or rural). <i>Numerator:</i> Deaths among children aged 0–4 years (0–59 months of age) <i>Denominator:</i> Number of live births (expressed per 1,000 live births) |
| Rationale | Achieving equitable health outcomes, across geographic areas, is an essential goal of primary health care. Under-five mortality includes infant and neonatal deaths and reflects the effectiveness of numerous essential services that children receive during their first years of life through primary health care systems, including but not limited to vaccinations, breastfeeding promotion, and nutrition counselling for mothers. It also reflects the social, economic and environmental conditions in which children (and others in society) live. Because data on the incidence and prevalence of diseases (morbidity data) frequently are unavailable, mortality rates are often used to identify vulnerable populations. This indicator captures more than 90% of global mortality among children under age 18. |
| Data Source & Year | Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), 2016. DHS is a nationally-representative household survey that provides data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health, and nutrition. Standard DHS surveys have large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households) and typically are conducted about every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. |
| Limitations | The reliability of estimates of under-five mortality depends on the accuracy and completeness of reporting and recording of births and deaths. Underreporting and misclassification are common. |
| VSP Methodology | N/A |
| Indicator cut points | Outcomes: Difference between urban and rural Red > 40 Yellow 3-40 Green ≤ 3 |

Appendices

Appendix 1: Tracer Items for Waste Disposal

- Safe final disposal of sharps: disposed externally, or incinerated or burned in a protected area or pit, or dumped in a protected area or covered pit; and no unprotected waste is observed on the day of the survey
- Safe final disposal of infectious/hazardous waste: disposed externally, or incinerated or burned in a protected area or pit, or dumped in a protected area or covered pit; and no unprotected waste is observed on the day of the survey
- Facility has guidelines in place for waste management and standard precautions

Appendix 2: Tracer Items for Infection Control

- Soap and running water, or hand disinfectant
- Appropriate storage of sharps waste (sharps box)
- Gloves
- Surface disinfectant
- Appropriate storage of infectious waste*
- Single use – standard disposable or auto-disable syringes*

*Available on SARA surveys only