Round table discussion

Health workforce indicators: let's get real

Ties Boerma[a] & Amani Siyam[a]

Health workforce indicators?[1] Those should be easy. We just need to count the numbers entering from training institutions or through re-entry, the numbers working, and the numbers exiting. If we know where these people work, we have the distribution of health workers within a country, and if we also have information on their competencies, responsiveness and productivity, we can know about their performance.

Sound health workforce statistics enable countries to develop policies that ensure the equitable and effective distribution of the workforce. They can be used to forecast needs by making projections and to plan accordingly. They can also be the basis for implementing policies to improve performance and the regulation of the public and private sectors. These statistics would also allow for reliable global monitoring of progress, including progress towards achieving benchmark targets,[2] and for monitoring the implementation of the WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel.[3]

And yet, health workforce statistics are fraught with measurement problems. This is not for lack of agreement on core indicators or because we do not know what needs to be monitored. And it is not because measuring indicators is complicated or costly, as is true in other areas of health. For some indicators, such as those that capture productivity, more work is needed, but many indicators are well established.[4,5]

Health workforce information systems fail to deliver comprehensive, reliable and timely data in many countries. As a consequence, planning and policy-making are often based on very limited evidence and global monitoring in areas such as the implementation of the Global Code and the setting of benchmarks is conducted with inadequate country statistics.

The challenges begin at the very basis: with the definition and classification of health workers. Indicators are intended for tracking progress over time, so country-specific definitions make it difficult to assess trends and conduct comparative analyses. The International Standard Classification of Occupations of the International Labour Organization facilitates the mapping of country health labour data, but it does little to take the statistical dimension into account, as is done, for example, for the International Classification of Diseases (ICD).[6] Some solvable issues are not well addressed, among them the classification of non-physician clinicians and community health workers.[7]

Measuring the size and distribution of the health workforce involves drawing data from several sources, including sources outside the health sector.[4] Currently too little is done to make use of these multiple, imperfect sources, reconcile the numbers and develop a best estimate. Human resources for health observatories aim to improve the information base,[8] yet to date they have had little impact on the quality of health workforce data and statistics.

It's time to get real. Reliable and comparable health workforce statistics are essential and global partners and countries simply have not invested enough. It is necessary to invest in health workforce registries. Carefully designed, these become timely and consistent sources of data on the health workforce. Creating such registries will take time. In addition, a census of health facilities should be conducted to update a database of the public and private sector workforce and lay the groundwork for a continuous health workforce registry. Such a census could also be used to collect information on characteristics such as infrastructure, medicines, diagnostic readiness and the observance of universal precautions for the prevention of nosocomial infections, and could therefore provide a comprehensive picture of service availability and readiness.[9] Finally, investments in strengthening country analytical capacity are crucial for improving the quality of health workforce statistics. ■

Competing interests: None declared.

References

1. Cometto G, Witter S. Tackling health workforce challenges to universal health coverage: setting targets and measuring progress. *Bull World Health Organ* 2013;91:881–5.
2. *The world health report 2006: working together for health*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2006. Available from: http://www.who.int/whr/2006. [accessed 16 August 2013].
3. *WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010. Available from: http://www.who.int/hrh/migration/code/code_en.pdf [accessed 16 August 2013].
4. Dal Poz MR, Gupta N, Quain E, Soucat ALB, editors. *Handbook on monitoring and evaluation of human resources for health with special applications for low- and middle-income countries*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009. Available from: http://www.who.int/hrh/resources/handbook/en/index.html [accessed 16 August 2013].
5. Pacqué-Margolis S, Ng C, Kauffman S. *Human resources for health (HRH) indicator compendium*. Washington: United States Agency for International Development; 2011. Available from: http://capacityplus.org/files/resources/HRH_Indicator_Compendium.pdf [accessed 16 August 2013].
6. International classification of diseases and related health problems, 10th revision. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010. Available from: http://apps.who.int/classifications/icd10/browse/2010/en [accessed 16 August 2013].
7. Mullan F, Frehywoth S. Non-physician clinicians in 47 sub-Saharan African countries. *Lancet* 2007;370:2158–63. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60785-5 PMID:17574662
8. Gedik G, Dal Poz M. Human Resources for Health Observatories: contributing to evidence-based policy decisions. *Hum Res Health Obs* 2012;10.
9. O'Neill K, Takane M, Sheffel A, Abouzahr C, Boerma T. Monitoring service delivery for universal health coverage: service availability and readiness assessment (SARA). *Bull World Health Organ* 2013. Forthcoming.

Towards universal health coverage: a health workforce fit for purpose and practice

James Campbell[a]

The finality of universal health coverage (UHC) is to ensure that *all* people are able to access the *quality* health services they *need* without suffering undue financial hardship. Margaret Chan describes it as the ultimate expression of *fairness*.[1] The italicized words above should therefore frame the starting point for a contemporary discourse on human resources for health

[a] World Health Organization, avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland.
Correspondence to Ties Boerma (e-mail: boermat@who.int).

in the post-2015 development agenda for health (2015–2030).

UHC is an aspirational concept. It establishes what is to be achieved but says little on how to get there.[2] However, the first step in accelerating progress towards UHC – building a health workforce that is both fit for purpose and fit to practice – is relatively simple. How does one go about it? By developing the competencies and regulatory frameworks needed to deliver quality care in accordance with the burden of disease and health priorities. The planning and implementation lens is *ex ante*: What health workforce do we need by 2030 to attain "effective coverage"[3–7] of an agreed package of care that meets the needs of all people, be they rich or poor? This line of questioning, which is increasingly evident,[8] generates the strategic intelligence to inform evidence-based decisions on human resources for health. Once need is quantified, a secondary but important policy consideration is pragmatism surrounding the available human and capital resources and fiscal space within national settings. Such pragmatism can inform the pace of acceleration towards UHC but should not undermine the initial workforce visioning process or the obligation of governments to deliver on the right to health.[9]

Existing thresholds for the required number of professional health workers (midwives, nurses and physicians) per 1000 population – 2.28 and 3.45 according to the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization, respectively[10–12] – provide valuable references for translating need into indicative workforce requirements, but they should be considered part of the process of planning the workforce to meet the needs of the population rather than an absolute target in countries currently below these thresholds. To promote effective coverage and deliver services closer to the client, it is essential to further analyse the availability or supply of the workforce; its accessibility in spatial, temporal and financial terms; its acceptability to clients; and its quality, in terms of performance. This entails using internationally recognized standards to classify the different occupations in the health workforce; gaining a better understanding of the health labour market within a country; moving beyond counting health workers to assessing their full-time equivalent and available working time; and being more cognisant of the skill mix – and educational pathways – required for the workforce to become fit for purpose.

To an extent, *The Kampala declaration and agenda for global action* and the *WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel* offer existing global benchmarks.[13,14] The accountability report from the meeting of the G8 held in June 2013 in Lough Erne, Northern Ireland, provides evidence that some countries are monitoring their recommended actions.[15] However, the international community has yet to fully grasp the inherent value of these documents in fostering accountability. The 2013 progress report on the Global Code of Practice, for example, is a sober reminder that existing health workforce recommendations are not being implemented at scale in all WHO regions.[16]

A contemporary strategy on human resources for health, embedded within the post-2015 development agenda for health, is needed to accelerate progress towards UHC. Such a strategy should promote effective coverage with health services staffed by a workforce that is both fit for purpose and fit to practice. This requires an accompanying accountability and reporting mechanism not only for tracking the stock or density of the health workforce or the coverage of health interventions, but for collating disaggregated data on the availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of the workforce to meet population needs, ensure the delivery of quality care and achieve fairness for all. ■

Competing interests: None declared.

References

1. World Health Organization [Internet]. Chan M. Universal coverage is the ultimate expression of fairness. Geneva: WHO; 2012. Available from: http://www.who.int/dg/speeches/2012/wha_20120523/en/index.html# [accessed 16 August 2013].
2. Giedion U, Alfonso EA, Díaz Y. *The impact of universal coverage schemes in the developing world: a review of the existing evidence*. Washington: The World Bank; 2013 (UNICO Studies Series No. 25). Available from: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/HEALTHNUTRITIONANDPOPULATION/Images/IMPACTofUHCSchemesinDevelopingCountries-AReviewofExistingEvidence.pdf [accessed 20 August 2013].
3. Shengelia B, Tandon A, Adams OB, Murray CJL. Access, utilization, quality, and effective coverage: an integrated conceptual framework and measurement strategy. *Soc Sci Med* 2005;61:97–109. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.055 PMID:15847965
4. Tanahashi T. Health service coverage and its evaluation. *Bull World Health Organ* 1978;56:295–303. PMID:96953
5. Campbell J. The route to effective coverage is through the health worker: there are no shortcuts. *Lancet* 2013;381:725. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60579-6 PMID:23472917
6. *Background paper for the Technical Consultation on Effective Coverage of Health Systems*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2001. Available from: http://www.who.int/health-systems-performance/technical_consultations/effcov_background.pdf [accessed 16 August 2013].
7. Graham WJ, McCaw-Binns A, Munjanja S. Translating coverage gains into health gains for all women and children: the quality care opportunity. *PLoS Med* 2013;10:e1001368. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001368 PMID:23335862
8. Ono T, Lafortune G, Schoenstein M. *Health workforce planning in OECD countries: a review of 26 projection models from 18 countries*. Ferney-Voltaire: OECD; 2013. Available from: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/workingpaper/5k44t787zcwb-en [accessed 16 August 2013].
9. Ooms G, Brolan C, Eggermont N, Eide A, Flores W, Forman L et al. Universal health coverage anchored in the right to health. *Bull World Health Organ* 2013;91:2–2A. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.12.115808 PMID:23397341
10. *The world health report 2006: working together for health*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2006. Available from: http://www.who.int/whr/2006/en/ [accessed 24 August 2013].
11. Scheil-Adlung X. Health workforce benchmarks for universal health coverage and sustainable development. *Bull World Health Organ* 2013;91:888–9.
12. Cometto G, Witter S. Tackling health workforce challenges to universal health coverage: setting targets and measuring progress. *Bull World Health Organ* 2013;91:881–885..
13. Global Health Workforce Alliance. *The Kampala declaration and agenda for global action*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2008. Available from: http://www.who.int/workforcealliance/knowledge/resources/kampala_declaration/en/ [accessed 16 August 2013].
14. Resolution WHA63.16. WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel. In: *Sixty-third World Health Assembly, Geneva, 17–21 May 2010. Resolutions and decisions*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013. Available from: http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA63-REC1/WHA63_REC1-P2-en.pdf [accessed 16 August 2013].
15. Gov.UK [Internet]. Lough Erne accountability report: keeping our promises. London: G8 UK; 2013. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/lough-erne-accountability-report [accessed 16 August 2013].
16. A 66/25. The health workforce: advances in responding to shortages and migration, and in preparing for emerging needs: report by the Secretariat. In: *Sixty-sixth World Health Assembly, Geneva, 20–28 May 2013*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013. Available from: http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA66/A66_25-en.pdf [accessed 16 August 2013].

[a] Instituto de Cooperación Social Integrare, Calle Balmes 30, 3°-1, 08007 Barcelona, Spain.
Correspondence to James Campbell (e-mail: jim.campbell@integrare.es).