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PCC stakeholder consultation objectives

1. Provide a platform for exchange on the concept of person-centred care in the HIV response.

2. The discussions, learnings and recommendations from the series will form the basis of a joint commentary article to build consensus around the concept of person-centred care. It will provide recommendations for different groups of stakeholders as they work towards realizing the full potential of person-centred care for the HIV response.
# PCC stakeholder consultation series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 AIDS 2022</td>
<td>Person-centred care approaches to improve quality of life for people living with and affected by HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 27 April 2023, ZOOM</td>
<td>What is the evidence supporting a person-centred care approach within the HIV response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 25 May 2023, ZOOM</td>
<td>What are the service delivery considerations for providing integrated person-centred care for people living with or affected by HIV throughout their life-course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 22 June 2023, ZOOM</td>
<td>What are the core elements and mechanisms for person-centred care within the HIV response and for different stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 IAS 2023</td>
<td>Interactive in-person workshop to prioritize the content for the consensus statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting 2: What is the evidence supporting a person-centred care approach within the HIV response?

Meeting objective
To take stock of the current evidence supporting the contribution of person-centred care to the well-being and health outcomes of people living with and affected by HIV.
Meeting 2: TODAY

Discussion questions
1. Which elements of the person-centred care frameworks resonate with you for the HIV response?
2. What is missing from the frameworks?
3. What does the evidence tell us about the contribution of person-centred care approaches to improved well-being and health outcomes for people living with and affected by HIV?
4. What are the current research gaps?
5. What priorities are emerging for person-centred care within the HIV response?
6. What does the evidence tell us about how to best operationalize person-centred care and does this differ depending on context and sub-populations?
Order of Events

1. PCC Personal Stories
2. Presentations (25 mins)
   - Overview of PCC frameworks and WHO guidance
   - Evidence on PCC-related interventions
   - Advances in PCC within HIV programming and other health areas
   - Strategies for long-term success
3. Breakout group discussions (15 mins)
4. Report back and moderated discussion (20 mins)

Moderator: Laura Beres
»I currently work in these hotspots to bring about change, with the experience that change is possible even on the streets. Someone held my hand when I lost hope, and I got back on my feet. Now, I’m doing the same for my fellow sex workers who have nowhere to call home and restoring hope to them that even within these hotspots, we can still take our ART and attain viral suppression.«

Annie, Peer Navigator, BHESP
Frameworks for Person and Patient Centered Services: a Research Agenda for the HIV Response

LIVE Team
Noelle Le Tourneau, Laura Beres, Chris Kemp, Marie-Claude Lavoie, Nathan Ford, Chanda Mwaba, Kombatende Sikombe, Ashley Underwood, Elvin Geng
Patient or person centeredness and the HIV public health

• Patient or person centeredness seems intuitive and comports with the spirit of the HIV response
• How do we implement and integrate it?
• The answer involves (in part)...
  • Shared conceptualization
  • How it meets needs of today’s HIV response
  • Models that activate via key mechanisms
• Challenges: scarcity, new challenges (e.g., COVID), heterogeneity
• Implications for the research agenda
Patient or person centered care imperative...

Expanding the Vision for Differentiated Service Delivery: A Call for More Inclusive and Truly Patient-Centered Care for People Living With HIV

Peter Ehrenkranz, MD, MPH, Anna Grimsrud, PhD, Charles B. Holmes, MD, MPH,
Peter Preko, MBChB, MPH, and Miriam Rabkin, MD, MPH
‘They care rudely!’: resourcing and relational health system factors that influence retention in care for people living with HIV in Zambia

Chanda Mwamba,1 Anjali Sharma,1 Niekwa Mukamba,1 Laura Beres,1,2
From concept to practice: dissecting the PCC

• Conceptual clarity
  • Existing models of patient-centeredness reveal a lack of conceptual clarity (Scholl)

• Mechanisms of application
  • This paper explores the current state of PCC ... potential barriers to its implementation (De Man)

• Operationalization
  • While numerous conceptual frameworks for PCC exist, a gap remains in practical guidance on PCC implementation (Santana)
An Integrative Model of Patient-Centeredness – A Systematic Review and Concept Analysis

Isabelle Scholl, Jördis M. Zill, Martin Härter, Jörg Dirmaier

Published: September 17, 2014 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0107828

- **Principles** (e.g., essential characteristics of provider; biopsychosocial view)
- **Enablers** (e.g., integration, access, coordination)
- **Activities** (e.g., empowerment, shared decision making)
ARTICLE

Patient-Centered Care and People-Centered Health Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa: Why So Little of Something So Badly Needed?

Jeroen De Man MD MPH\textsuperscript{a}, Roy William Mayega MBChB MPH PhD\textsuperscript{b}, Nandini Sarkar MA\textsuperscript{c}.

- Socio-economic (e.g., culture, legal systems)
- Structural (e.g., funding, verticalization)
- Health care worker (e.g., training)
Interpersonal (e.g., communications training)

Clinical (e.g., portal)

Structural (e.g., clinic design)
Person-centred care made simple

Care is... personalized

Care is... coordinated

Care is... enabling

Person is treated with... dignity, compassion, respect
Gidden’s Structuration Theory: PCC as a Social System

1. System effects to constrain or enable PCC practices
   - Community score card (Laterra 2020)
   - Patients rights training (MacLauren 2018)

2. Actors effects on systems and structures toward PCC
   - Providers enable conversation (Wachira 2021)

3. Actors’ effects on experience
   - Facilitation (Sikombe 2023)

4. System influences on patient experience
   - Adolescent friendly days (Zanoni)

Behavior of actors in the systems (HCW, lay, communities)
Structures for service delivery (regulations, resources)
Patient experience and outcomes
Challenges and needs for PCC in the HIV research agenda

• Empowerment and Activism vs. Stigma and Marginalization
• Verticalized Funding vs. Universal Health Coverage
• Workforce vs. Moral Injury and Burnout
• Target Driven Performance vs. Personalization
Conclusions

• Getting to the finish line in public health is not about who gets there first, but what we can do to make sure that all arrive.

• Bringing personalized public health into practice will require us to turn the idea of meeting patients halfway from a notion into a genuine scientific agenda.

• Creating a shared research agenda on the conceptualization (particularly with LMIC perspectives), to models of care, can help push the agenda forward.
Evidence on person-centred care interventions among people living with HIV in low and middle-income countries: A systematic review
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1 Background
PCC systematic review objectives

1. What **types of PCC interventions**, intended to improve **patient-provider interactions**, have been employed to support HIV-related outcomes among people living with HIV in low- and middle-income countries (LIMCs)?

2. What are the **effects of PCC strategies** that focus on **improving patient-provider interactions** on HIV cascade outcomes and patient/provider experiences in LMICs?
2 Methods
Methods

Search

- We searched Embase, Medline, Scopus, Cochrane, CINAHL and select HIV-related conferences (i.e., IAS/AIDS, ICASA, Adherence)
- Search conducted up to January 2023

Guiding frameworks

- PCC interventions – Scholl and De Man
- Implementation outcomes – Proctor’s framework
- Intervention specification – Hickey, et al.
Methods

Synthesis
- Descriptive
- Narrative synthesis

Risk of bias
- Cochrane Risk of Bias (RCT)
- Newcastle-Ottawa Scale tool (non-RCT)
- Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklist (qualitative)
- Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (mixed methods)
PCC systematic review preliminary findings
Study Selection

- 6650 records screened
- 33 unique studies included, represented in 42 records
Included studies: geographic distribution
Characteristics of included studies (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT or cRCT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and post</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled before and after</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children or children and adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents or adolescents and young adults</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant/Breastfeeding women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key population (sex workers)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interventions: PCC intervention types

- 20 studies (61%) had PCC intervention as part of a multicomponent intervention (versus PCC as the sole intervention)
- 6 inductively identified types of PCC interventions employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCC intervention type category*</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing friendly and welcoming services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individualized counseling and patient-centered communication</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Additional patient outreach</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provider sensitization training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Training patients in empowerment and communication skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feedback to health workers regarding patient concerns and evaluations of service quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not exclusive- studies may be included in ≥1 PCC categories
### Scholl dimensions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholl dimensions*</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clinician-patient relationship</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clinician-patient communication</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Patient involvement in care</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Biopsychosocial perspective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Patient information</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access to care</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Essential characteristics of the clinician</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Patient empowerment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coordination and continuity of care</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Patient as a unique person</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Physical support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Emotional support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Integration of medical &amp; non-medical care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teamwork and teambuilding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Involvement of family and friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not exclusive- studies may be included in ≥1 PCC components*
## Study outcomes reported (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes reported</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage to HIV care or ART initiation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention in care</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to ART</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral suppression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-related outcomes*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e.g., patient satisfaction, patient-provider communication, quality of services, economic-related outcomes*
### Percentage of studies with a comparison group reporting a positive effect of the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV Care Cascade</th>
<th>PCC outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage to ART care</td>
<td>Patient-provider communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to ART</td>
<td>Perceived quality of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Economic-related outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral Suppression</td>
<td>Patient satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive effect of the intervention
Percentage of outcomes among studies with a comparison group reporting a positive effect of the intervention by category of PCC intervention type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pt outreach</th>
<th>Friendly services</th>
<th>Pt training</th>
<th>Pt communication</th>
<th>HCW feedback</th>
<th>HCW sensitization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage to HIV service</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART initiation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral suppression</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic-related outcomes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC Outcome- Patient satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC Outcome- Patient-provider comm</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC Outcome- Perceived quality of care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Challenges and opportunities to advance PCC
Summary of key findings

- HIV care cascade outcomes; 44%-50% of studies reported a positive effect of the intervention (remaining studies had no effect).
- Among studies reporting PCC-related outcomes with a comparison group, 100% reported at least one outcome with a positive effect of the intervention.
- Most studies included adults with few studies focusing on children (n=2) and KP (n=2)
- PCC-related outcomes were measured in 24% of studies with broad diversity in measurements and PCC-related outcomes.
Challenges/gaps

- Limited description of the intervention and understanding the mechanisms of how the interventions work
- Heterogeneity in outcome definitions and measurements
- Inconsistent inclusion of PCC-related outcomes—patient’s voices often missing
- Few studies included key populations (n=2)
Opportunities to advance PCC

◉ Realist reviews with stakeholder engagement to better understand mechanisms to inform guidelines and policy

◉ Guidance on PCC-related outcomes and measurements to improve consistency, comparison, and application

◉ From PCC good practice statements to guidelines (how?)

◉ Inclusion of participatory research
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Integrated person-centered care in HIV as a bridge to Universal Health Coverage

Dr. Ibou Thior | Senior Technical Advisor | PATH
Chris Collins | President & CEO | Friends of the Global Fight against AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria
2030 global health goals ➔ how do we get there?

- HIV response has pioneered service delivery strategies that work for diverse people in different settings.
- Despite gains, progress towards 2030 HIV epidemic control goals has stalled.
- Concurrently working towards ensuring all people can access affordable, equitable, non-discriminatory, and high-quality services through universal health coverage (UHC) by 2030.
- Call for investing in integrated person-centered care (IPCC) as a mechanism to get the HIV response back on track and forge a pathway towards UHC.

Source: UNAIDS. *A triple dividend: The health, social and economic gains from financing the HIV response in Africa*. 2023.
Understanding IPCC in HIV and its potential as a pathway to Universal Health Coverage

Questions we sought to answer

• How can HIV services better deliver IPCC that responds to the broader health care needs of people living with and affected by HIV?

• How can IPCC within the HIV platform be expanded to address other health needs and barriers hampering expansion?

• How can these identified models influence efforts to expand access to primary health care (PHC)?

How we answered them

• Desk review → peer-reviewed scientific and grey literature on service integration and person-centered health service delivery approaches.

• Key stakeholder interviews

30 interviews

Researchers

Civil society/ advocates

Normative agencies

PLHIV networks

Implementers

Funders

Private-sector
Integrated person-centered care

We define IPCC to be “integrated care that is designed and delivered in a manner that is responsive to the broader health and wellness needs of individuals through their life course and tailored to reflect their preferences.”
Key attributes of IPCC

Holistic
Be comprehensive, holistic, and coordinated.

Convenient
Prioritize individual convenience, making it for individuals to access needed services while reducing disincentives to avoid needing health care.

Respectful
Respect each individual’s values and differences.

Empowering
Empower clients and their households and communities to participate actively in their own care.

Responsive
Actively solicit clients’ feedback and adapt service approaches in response.
Lessons learned from delivering IPCC through the HIV response
What have we learned from applying IPCC to the HIV response?

When it comes to IPCC in HIV, one size does not fit all.

- Differentiated service delivery (DSD) → Facilitates client choice by providing menu of options for how, where, from whom, and when to receive services.
- Integration of HIV services in mainstream PHC systems improves access and satisfaction for some, but not all.
- Important to offer integrated service packages through specialized delivery channels for key and marginalized populations who are not well-served at public health/PHC facilities.

Improving the convenience of health services improves health outcomes.

Three approaches:

- "One stop shop" models: 1) integrate services in a single site; 2) use a multi-disciplinary team approach to offer various services.
- DSD through multi-month dispensing, decentralized dispensing at non-facility outlets, extended service hours, or community or virtual approaches for follow-up care.
- Advances in health technology that facilitate point-of-care diagnostics and offer multiple methods for delivering treatment or prevention.

Communities are essential partners in IPCC.

- Community-led responses are a key pillar in the HIV response; critical for mitigating health systems gaps.
- Communities play multiple roles to optimize the well-being of people living with or affected by HIV—accountability watchdogs, service providers, implementers, researchers, advocates, citizens.
- Community contributions need to be recognized; further scaled through human-centered design/co-design and community-led service delivery and monitoring; and compensated.
What have we learned from applying IPCC to the HIV response?

HIV can contribute to health service integration.
Two ways to integrate HIV and non-HIV services:
1) Non-HIV-specific services into HIV service delivery platforms: Example: Sexual health services, and screening and treatment for non-communicable diseases (NCDs) and viral hepatitis as part of care packages for people living with HIV.
2) HIV services into non-HIV-specific service delivery platforms: Example: HIV screening and linkage to care at family planning and reproductive health wards.

HIV response has strengthened health systems, enabling IPCC expansion.
HIV programming and investments have contributed to overall pandemic response and health systems strengthening:
- Upgrading health facility infrastructure
- Advancing laboratory, surveillance, and health information systems.
- Enabling multi-disease diagnostic platforms.
- Financing and training health care workers.

Proof point: HIV-financed infrastructure and platforms rapidly pivoted to contribute to COVID-19 response.
- Vietnam: Staff from key population-led/owned clinics providing HIV services rapidly pivoted to deliver COVID-19 vaccinations in government campaigns.
- India: The national HIV health information system provided a learning platform to rapidly gather client-level COVID-19 diagnoses in real-time.
Recommendations for scaling IPCC
Further work to make IPCC standard practice for HIV services across all settings and populations, most critically for prevention (integrating HIV, sexual and reproductive health, and gender-based violence) and comorbidities, including NCDs and mental health.

1. Further scale up IPCC within HIV services.
   - Lack of metrics and mechanisms to measure progress towards and the degree to which services adhere to IPCC attributes and principles.

2. Integrate services incrementally and learn by doing.
   - Rapid acceleration of HIV-related IPCC to other health areas could compromise the quality of HIV services.

Stepwise approach to scale IPCC beyond HIV, enabling programs to incrementally address core issues (financing, policy frameworks, client confidentiality, health worker skills building) sustainably without losing the unique attributes of HIV.

How can we build on these lessons to scale IPCC?
How can we build on these lessons to scale IPCC?

1) Development of indicators to measure IPCC, including quality-focused indicators; 2) Complementary mechanisms to measure progress against IPCC indicators and facilitate client, provider, and community perspectives (community-led monitoring; service quality feedback mechanisms).

Monitor and use results to inform IPCC expansion.

Faltering progress towards global 2030 HIV epidemic control goals → slowdown in preventing new HIV infections and AIDS-related deaths driven by inequities.

Recognize that service integration is not appropriate for all.

Services offered by public sector systems do not effectively address key and marginalized populations’ needs, with many seeking services through other “non-traditional” models.

Need to preserve and sustainably finance these dedicated, community-tailored systems that exist outside the traditional public-sector system, while advancing service integration within these specialized channels.
Technological innovations and HIV DSD models introduced during COVID-19 highlighted pathways for additional IPCC expansion. Funders to incentivize IPCC beyond HIV, with IPCC-related metrics used for accountability and advocacy to ensure advancement.

Incentivize innovation in the scale-up of IPCC.

COVID-19 highlighted opportunities to further mainstream IPCC within HIV and broader PHC services.

Make new health investments to enable IPCC scale-up.

Relative lack of focused financing to address weaknesses in national health systems and cross-cutting systems platforms.

Added investments in key areas—workforce training, community-led responses, health information systems—to bolster the foundation for scaled IPCC, while allowing greater flexibility in existing financing streams and leveraging of national health insurance mechanisms.
How can we build on these lessons to scale IPCC?

**Prepare the health workforce to deliver IPCC.**

Current health workforce (especially those financed by a vertical health area) tend to be specialized and have limited experience offering services in other areas.

**Ensure transparent, inclusive engagement and governance.**

Inadequate involvement of communities in designing, planning, monitoring, and demanding IPCC across all health areas.

7. Substantial and **sustained investment** in tailored and continuous **training, mentoring, and supporting** (technical [job aids; workflow tools]; and financial [incentives; improved pay]) clinic, community, and lay **health workforce** cadres.

8. 1) Informing communities of the **tangible benefits of IPCC** and UHC; 2) Enhanced **processes for citizen engagement** in demanding IPCC; 3) Ensure **community representation at health policy decision-making bodies**.
Three critical actions to fully realize the promise of IPCC

**Invest in the health workforce:**
The health care workforce is essential to success, pointing to the importance of training and ongoing support to enable health workers to own and carry forward the additional tasks required for IPCC.

**Strengthen and support community responses:**
Community systems need sufficient resources to play their critical role in IPCC, serving as a liaison between communities and health facilities and having the capacity to move quickly in the event of a health emergency.

**Use monitoring to improve service quality:**
Routine client feedback systems must be in place and used to improve the quality, fit and impact of health services.
HIV updates: Strategies for long-term success

Prof. Jeffrey V. Lazarus [Jeffrey.Lazarus@ISGlobal.org]
Professor, CUNY Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy
Associate Research Professor, ISGlobal, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Spain
Associate Professor, Faculty of Medicine, University of Barcelona
Member, Policy and Public Health Committee, EASL
WHO Global health sector strategy on HIV for the period 2022–2030

- The WHO strategy calls for a more precise focus to reach the most affected and at-risk of HIV and AIDS to address inequities, as they prevent the world from ending the HIV and AIDS epidemic.

- An opportunity to go beyond ART and viral suppression: a more holistic, people-centred HIV care approach focused on long-term well-being addressing HRQoL, multimorbidity in people living with HIV (NCDs, mental health, etc.) and stigma and discrimination.

HRQoL in the WHO GHSS 2022-2030

Source: WHO Global health sector strategy on HIV for the period 2022–2030
HRQoL is not addressed as a quantitative target on the WHO’s 2022–2030 global health sector strategies on HIV

The strategy falls short of making a commitment to monitoring global progress toward improving HRQoL outcomes in people living with HIV and assessing impact and service coverage.

- Addressing HRQoL related to people living with HIV can be relatively new for health systems.
- Without institutionalised targets, health systems may not recognise the importance of reporting on the HRQoL of people living with HIV.

HRQoL, health-related quality of life; WHO, World Health Organization.
PARADIGM SHIFT:
A NEW ERA FOR HIV CARE

THE TRANSITION FROM DISEASE-CENTRED HEALTH SYSTEMS AND HIV CARE TO HOLISTIC, PEOPLE-CENTRED HIV CARE WITHIN INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEMS
Paradigm shift: beyond viral suppression

Disease-centred HIV care
- Focus on ART and viral suppression

People-centred HIV care
- Focus on long-term well-being and HRQoL

A global consensus on advancing the long-term well-being of PLHIV
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A multidisciplinary panel of 44 global HIV experts, including PLHIV, clinicians and researchers, was convened to identify key issues that health systems must address to move beyond their focus on viral suppression and advance the long-term wellbeing of PLHIV from a patient-centred perspective.

Key next steps from the consensus on advancing the long-term well-being of PLHIV

Box 3 | Key next steps for health systems to advance the long-term well-being of people living with HIV

1. Incorporate the monitoring of comorbidities in electronic health records, where feasible, for use in integrated clinical care and international multimorbidity monitoring.
2. Develop and pilot models of care that employ frameworks for healthy aging, frailty, functional ability, and other dimensions of health that are relevant to PLHIV, using HRQoL as a key outcome measure. Meaningfully involve PLHIV in these efforts.
3. Expand integrated HIV and primary care outreach services to locations and times that reduce access barriers for marginalized and vulnerable groups. Pilot integrated models of care for these groups that link them with the formal health system, including community-based health and psychosocial services and peer support programs.
4. Establish annual surveys of PLHIV, conducted at the subnational and/or facility level, to collect and document data on HRQoL and on experiences of stigma and discrimination in healthcare settings.
5. Implement interventions to strengthen empathy among healthcare staff and decrease stigma and discrimination in healthcare settings. These should be accompanied by interventions involving peers and community members, which can reduce internalized stigma in PLHIV by enhancing the effect of protective factors such as empowerment, social support, resistance, and adaptive coping strategies.
The Long-Term Success (LTS) Framework

- HIV management goals have shifted to meet the evolving needs of people living with HIV.

- Re-defining long-term success (LTS), in light of the new WHO strategy, is necessary to help address these needs.

- An expert panel co-created a framework to help guide clinical practice and establish LTS as a new goal in the HIV management landscape.

- The framework includes five key outcome pillars that, if achieved, would support the LTS vision of every person living with HIV being able to live their best life.

Sources:
Five pillars were identified by the expert panel that support the vision for LTS $^{1,2}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired outcome</th>
<th>1. Getting viral load to undetectable was identified as the primary treatment goal</th>
<th>Sustained undetectable viral load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Treatment-related factors and excessive clinic visits were identified as the most notable burden of living with HIV</td>
<td>Minimal impact of treatment and clinical monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintaining “optimal” health-related QoL was identified as an important goal for people living with HIV</td>
<td>Optimised health-related quality of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consistency of care among different HCPs was identified as a key factor in improving healthcare outcomes</td>
<td>Lifelong integration of healthcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stigma and discrimination were identified as key barriers to achieving optimal healthcare outcomes for people living with HIV</td>
<td>Freedom from stigma and discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HCP, healthcare professional; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; LTS, long-term treatment success; QoL, quality of life.

Priority areas moving forward

Integrate patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) and patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) into clinical practice

People-centred, integrated health service delivery models

Availability of digital health technologies and tools

Recognising the importance of social determinants of health and inequity, stigma and discrimination, mental health, disability and life rehabilitation
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PCC Stakeholder Consultation Series

Session 2 - 27 April 2023

What is the evidence supporting a person-centred care approach within the HIV response?

With support from: GILEAD
Order of Events

1. PCC Personal Stories
2. Presentations (25 mins)
   - Overview of PCC frameworks and WHO guidance
   - Evidence on PCC-related interventions
   - Advances in PCC within HIV programming and other health areas
   - Strategies for long-term success
3. Breakout group discussions (15 mins)
4. Report back and moderated discussion (20 mins)
Reflections on PCC personal stories

Daisy Kwala, health rights activist and counsellor, Bar Hostess and Empowerment Support Programme, Kenya

Charmaine Chu, registered psychologist, Xavier University, Ateneo de Cagayan University, Philippines

Rodenie Olete, registered nurse, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan, Republic of China

Viral suppression NO LONGER is the MOST Important, in USA for older PWH but co-morbidities are NOW MOST IMPORTANT, not viral suppression.

WE NEED BETTER CARE in CLINIC for OLDER PWH !!!!!!!

We have 23 aging/HIV clinics in USA.

I put aging in USA NHAS.

I am 73 yr old PWH with multi-comorbidities including declining physical function. I can tell you once your health declines care is ALL that matter.

We elderly PWH are worried about alzheimers.

Optimal ACCESS is critical to us elderly PWH >65. We do not have good & optimal care. The clinics in NY & USA are very congested and hard to get care needs met for PWH >65.

Great to hear from healthcare providers as well as clients

Support by care clinic is MOST important.

Good care for PWH >65 is MOST critical. Care is horrible for elderly PWH.

I helped create these aging/HIV clinics.

what about self-support and peer support?

Eldery PWH >65 need priority in getting good care.

Clinics are NOT providing good care to elderly PWH

Good care from clinic is more important than peer support.

There is geriatric testing in clinics: bone mineral density, cognitive impairment, frailty.

There are no mental health care services available.

Thank you for highlighting mental health needs!

PCC is aimed to provide an all-inclusive approach when it comes to management of HIV. Aspects Included: psychological, economical, well-being, education.
Elvin Geng
Overview of PCC frameworks and WHO guidance on PCC

Questions:

- Patient-centered vs. person-centered vs. people-centered: curious to get a better understanding of the implications of each term and when each should be used.
- How do we accommodate the different interpersonal aspects of patients to meet the threshold of PCC?
- How do we deal with PCC HIV in different countries as we have exchange programmes in our countries and being in a country with strong relation with the country I am country I
- From Nyarayi Hwayire in chat: How do we deal with PCC HIV in different countries as we have exchange programmes in our countries and being in a country with strong relation with the country I am country I?
- I would want to know what is in the PCC for health professionals living with HIV to stop stigma and discrimination? As well as sometimes harassment and bullying from HIV prof
- NH in chat: Stressing PCC data and confidentiality. In the PCC understand consent and when PLHIV refuses interventions, I am mainly focusing on Health professionals II

New Thoughts Provoked:

- Good to see Santana model mentioned, some update on it here: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33303351/

- I agree with the cyclical impact of structural factors and the actors/service providers

- From Nyarayi Hwayire in chat: I would want to know what is in the PCC for health professionals living with HIV to stop stigma and discrimination? As well as sometimes harassment and bullying from HIV prof.

- ONCE A PWH gets to be 65 & has multi-comorbidities better care is all that matters !!!!!! Care is horrible or older PWH in NYC & USA.

- From NH in chat: I am mainly focusing on Health professionals living with HIV treatment in work places at health setting, Direct discrimination and indirect discrimination.
Marie-Claude Lavoie
Evidence on PCC related interventions for people living with HIV in low and middle-income countries

Questions:

For countries with limited staff-client ratios, how can health providers maintain quality interactions with clients while meeting workload deliverables?

What is in the PCC framework in terms of surveillance and control of health professionals living with HIV rights and wrongs?

Which size are the effects when positive on the several steps of the cascade? Significant but large enough?

Very good point. We will include this detailed information in the systematic review so readers can see the effect size and confidence interval.

New Thoughts Provoked:

Real great review - very helpful to understand helpful activities. It would be great to better understand some of the mechanisms of action: HOW are outcomes achieved?

Good to also learn about implementation - what encourages staff to "act differently"?

There is indeed a need for more participatory research to improve PCC interventions.

Yes, I agree! It will be the next part of the work related to this systematic review.

We need better care for elderly PWH >65. Good care is not there for older PWH. Elderly & older PWH with comorbidities need better care. Viral suppression is not that important.

Thank you for your comments. We will look more closely at the age groups included in the study population and highlight this gap if identified.

I agree!
Ibou Thior & Chris Collins

Advances in PCC within HIV programming and in other health areas, as a bridge towards primary health care and universal health coverage, including a discussion on barriers to implementing PCC

Questions:

Thank you for emphasizing "co-location" as an important factor of PCC. Do we have studies explaining the cost-effectiveness of co-located services?

New Thoughts Provoked:

- All older PWH need geriatric screenings, bone mineral testing, frailty, cognitive impairment & BETTER CARE.
- Mental health care & services are absent in HIV clinics
- We need aging/HIV clinics which provide geriatric care all over globe
- In USA we now have 23 aging/HIV clinics. Which played key role in implementing. Colocation of care is critical
- On behalf of global health, HIV specific responses are under attack!
Jeffrey V. Lazarus
HIV updates: Strategies for long-term success

Questions:

Why are you not talking about greater needs of older PWH?

I am based in NYC & the care is horrible for older & worse for elderly PWH.

20 minute visits are mandated & an older PWH CANNOT get the care they need & clinics are getting more & more constricted.

HRQL is multidimensional, which dimensions should be reasonably improved with Person centered care?

What effective strategies are done to eliminate stigma and discrimination in traditional countries?

New Thoughts Provoked:

the elderly PWH >65 are the most at risk & need the most improved care.
Which elements of the PCC framework resonate with you for the HIV response?

- Interact on these notes & add your own!
- Building trust and knowing providers and clients well.
- Implementation: reluctance of implementers in mainstreaming other health needs of PLHIV
- i (integrated) in the IPCC
- Challenge of acceptability of PCC from the perspectives of health providers. Lacking evaluation tools in checking PCC's feasibility for HCPs.
- centering on the person, holistic care, understanding day-in, day-out it's a journey over a life, needs do and will change, barriers are real, consider social determinants. AskQtns
What is missing from the frameworks?

- Challenge of acceptability of PCC from the perspectives of health providers. Lacking evaluation tools in checking PCC's feasibility for HCPs.
- Need for interprofessional guidance to make healthcare professionals work together, across health areas and integrate.
- Last campaign for HIV awareness was 30 years ago in Italy.
- We don't get ANY support from the government here in Italy.
- Barriers to funding from faith based organizations that ideologically oppose our way of life.
- Emphasis on changing the work culture to promote PCC (health system factors).
- Frameworks are missing guidance for healthcare professionals living with HIV.
- Access to care for migrants! We in Europe can access ART but what about migrants to Europe.
- Sustainability of funding is a BIG issue. Too much PROJECT based funding.
- Include/consider the individual's cultural determinants of health and wellbeing (see research by Prof Lovett, https://researchers.anu.edu.au/researchers/lovett-rw)
What does the evidence tell us about the contribution of person-centred care approaches to improved well-being and health outcomes for people living with and affected by HIV?
What are the current research gaps?

Service integration guidance is needed.
What priorities are emerging for person-centred care within the HIV response?

Stigma & discrimination remain as the barrier, especially within the healthcare setting.

Service integration

Other integrated health services might still be inaccessible if S&D remains. Measurable processing and addressing S&D should be developed.

Operationalizing PCC for practice and policy

Confidentiality and data protection

There has been no discussion about research investments for PCC interventions for the children adolescents who are disproportionately more unsuppressed in Africa
What does the evidence tell us about how to best operationalize person-centred care and does this differ depending on context and sub-populations?
Other reflections:
PCC stakeholder consultation series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS 2022</td>
<td>Person-centred care approaches to improve quality of life for people living with and affected by HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 April 2023, ZOOM</td>
<td>What is the evidence supporting a person-centred care approach within the HIV response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May 2023, ZOOM</td>
<td>What are the service delivery considerations for providing integrated person-centred care for people living with or affected by HIV throughout their life-course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June 2023, ZOOM</td>
<td>What are the core elements and mechanisms for person-centred care within the HIV response and for different stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS 2023</td>
<td>Interactive in-person workshop to prioritize the content for the consensus statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting 3: What are the service delivery considerations for providing integrated person-centred care for people living with or affected by HIV throughout their life course?

Meeting objective
To reflect on the practical service delivery considerations for delivering integrated person-centred care services, as well as the role of client-reported outcomes and quality of life measures.
Meeting 3: 25 May 2023

Discussion questions

1. What actionable feedback can we provide to healthcare workers and health system administrators on clients' needs and preferences?
2. At the policy and financing level, what measures should be considered to promote person-centred care approaches?
3. What type of demand-creation and awareness-raising activities (Including about client rights, existing services and eligibility criteria for different services) should be implemented to support clients in taking informed choices about their health?
4. What can we learn from the development of differentiated service delivery frameworks and their implementation?
Thank you for your participation