PEPFAR Spending Types and Reduction in HIV Infection Rates

By Stephen Walker, PhD

Abstract

Since 2004, PEPFAR has invested over $100 billion in fighting HIV, primarily targeting sub-Saharan Africa. This study examines the effectiveness of spending types as defined by the program. In this study, I take the spending data published by PEPFAR that was categorized into key focus areas that include (1) Care & Treatment, (2) Testing, (3) Prevention, (4) Socioeconomic, and (5) Above-site, Program Management and Other, and estimate the effectiveness of these categories on a key outcome variable: new HIV infections. I also estimate the same regressions for the period prior to and post PEPFAR 2.0 that was implemented in 2014. Data was collected from public sources including PEPFAR, the GHO, and the World Bank and a total of $61.5 billion in spending was identified from 2005-2021 covering 54 target countries.

Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s): The marginal dollar spent on prevention activities experienced the highest incremental effect of reducing new HIV infections in targeted countries from 2005-2021. The coefficient on Prevention spending was -0.715 (t-stat of -2.83), which was highly significant at the 1 percent level. However, much of this effect was driven by pre-2014 spending before PEPFAR 2.0 was implemented. Post 2014, socioeconomic programs were measured to have the greatest marginal effect. Overall effectiveness of spending increased post PEPFAR 2.0.

Introduction

The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) was created in 2003 and annual funding for the program has grown from $2.2 billion in 2004 to 7.0 billion in 2022 (KFF 2022). PEPFAR was designed to address the problem that "more than 90% of all HIV infections were occurring in resource-limited countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where patients had little or no access to antiretroviral medications" (Fauci and Eisinger 2018). In addition to treatment, "PEPFAR has also provided some of the critical workforce, organizational, and physical infrastructure to address other concerns" (Fauci and Eisinger 2018).

Various studies have examined PEPFAR funding on health outcomes. Duber, et al. (2010) published a retrospective analysis and compared PEPFAR focus versus non-focus counties on various national health indicators (e.g., adult mortality and incidence of TB) and found that countries were either slightly worse off or not different. The authors concluded that PEPFAR "may have little or no impact on health outcomes not explicitly targeted." Another paper by Chin, et al. (2015) applied a fixed-effects panel regression analysis on twelve African countries from 2002-2010 and found that HIV infection rates decreased by 0.355 percentage points for every 1 percentage point increase in funding per GDP. While the effect was statistically significant, they concluded that "the reduction rate should be higher." This study extends this earlier work by Chin, et al. and explores the cross-sectional variation in total funding for PEPFAR countries. This study focuses on the subcategories of spending measured by PEPFAR that include care and treatment, testing, prevention, socio-economic spending, and other types of spending that include above-site preparation, program management, and pipeline spending. The purpose of this study is to document the effects for these spending categories that may help policy makers better allocate capital resources. Does prevention spending outperform socioeconomic spending at the margin or vice-versa? This study documents these differences that may be helpful to PEPFAR administrators when allocating spending budgets.

Data was collected from public sources. PEPFAR funding data comes from the PEPFAR website[1]. New HIV infection rates per thousand in population was sourced from the SDGHIV file from the GHO Odata api[2]. Population used to scale PEPFAR funding comes from the World Bank file.[3]

Table 1 summarizes the spending identified by PEPFAR by type and year. A total of $61.5 billion was identified from 2005-2021. Care & Treatment represents 46.1 percent of the spend. Above-site, program management and other spending consumed 29.1 percent of the budget. Testing was 7.2 percent, prevention was 9.5 percent, and socioeconomic was 8.2 percent.

Methods

Six fixed effects panel regressions were estimated that take the following form:

$$NEWHIV_{i,t} = \propto \ + \beta_1 SPEND_{i,t} + Country\ FE + Year\ FE + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

The dependent variable NEWHIV is defined as the new HIV infection rate per thousand in population. The SPEND variable is the total dollar value for each spending category identified by PEPFAR, scaled by population. Country and year fixed effects were included. The SPEND variable represents one of Total Spending, or each of the subcategories including Care & Treatment, Testing, Prevention, Socioeconomic, and above-site/program management/other types.

A final model is estimated that takes the following form, which includes all subcategories and all other that add up to Total Spending.

$$NEWHIV_{i,t} = \propto \ + \beta_1 Care\&Treatment_{i,t} + \ \beta_1 Testing_{i,t} + \ \beta_1 Prevention_{i,t} + \ \beta_1 Socioeconomic_{i,t} + \ \beta_1 Other_{i,t} + Country\ FE + Year\ FE + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

Standard errors are clustered at the firm level. The theoretical prediction for the sign of each variable is negative as the goal is to decrease new HIV infections.

[1] https://data.pepfar.gov/
[2] https://www.who.int/data/gho/info/gho-odata-api
[3] https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL

Results & Discussion

The results of these models are summarized in Table 2. Consistent with the prior literature, the measured coefficient is negative on total PEPFAR funding and was significant at the one percent level (t-stat of -4.94). The coefficient of -0.119 can be interpreted in the following way. For every $1 per person increase in spending for a given country, the new HIV infection rate per 1,000 decreases by 0.11. Compared to the mean rate in the data of 2.5 per 1,000, this effect appears small, consistent with the previous literature.

Exploring how each spending type matters, the second column from Table 2 shows the estimate for Care & Treatment spending, which was -0.205 (t-stat of -3.28) and significant at the 1 percent level, which is a near doubling of the overall effect measured. Services included in this category include programs such as HIV clinical services, HIV laboratory services, HIV Drugs, and other care and treatment. Among the spending categories, it is measured as the most significant variable. The third column explores Testing spending, which includes facility-based testing, community-based testing, and other testing programs. The results documented in Table 2 imply that there is no significance with increased testing spending though the size effect is larger than the total spending at -0.388. While testing is important to reduce new infections, there may be wide variation in outcomes from country to country which contributes to the lack of significance. The fourth column reports Prevention spending, which includes community mobilization, Prep, Condom and lubricant programming, medication assisted therapy, primary prevention for HIV and sexual violence programs. In Table 2, prevention spending shows the highest marginal effect among the spending types with a coefficient of -0.715 (t-stat of -2.83), which is 6x the effect of total overall spending. The fifth column reports Socioeconomic spending, which includes case management, economic strengthening, education assistance, food and nutrition, psychosocial support, legal, human right and protection, and other socioeconomic spending. Similar to Testing, Socioeconomic spending was not significant. The sixth column captures above-site, program management and other unidentified spending. Results are similar to Care & Treatment in this model and significant at the 1 percent level. Lastly, all variables that sum to total funding were estimated in the seventh column. Controlling for each of the other spending types, Care & Treatment is the most statistically significant (t-stat of -5.53), but

Prevention spending measured the highest with an estimated coefficient of -0.639 (t-stat of -3.29).

Banigbe, et al. (2019) studied the effect of PEPFAR policy change in Nigeria with the introduction of PEPFAR 2.0 that occurred in 2014. “The transition to PEPFAR 2.0 with its focus on country ownership was accompanied by substantial funding cuts” and “Funding cutbacks have been associated with compromised quality of care” (Banigbe, et al. 2019). This discontinuity is observed in the data for 2014 in Table 1. Therefore, to explore whether PEPFAR 2.0 had any effect on these measures, Table 3 re-estimates the previous regressions, but for 2015-2021. Table 4 repeats this process for 2005-2013. Both avoid the 2014 transition year in the estimation. The results from Table 3 show that, while prevention spending still matters, Socioeconomic programs were measured to have the largest marginal effect, with high statistical significance (t-stat of -7.43). The overall effect of total spending improves slightly from -0.093 (t-stat -6.48) prior to 2014 in Table 4 to -0.140 (t-stat -5.71) post 2014 reported in Table 3.

Conclusion

This study documents the cross-sectional effects of subcategories of PEPFAR spending from 2005-2021. One key finding is that prevention spending has the largest effect on new HIV infection rates over the other spending categories, overall. Also, PEPFAR 2.0 may have had a net positive impact on the program improving the overall effect of the program as results post 2014 show an the overall spending measure. Studying these effects may be helpful to policy makers in the allocation of budgets in PEPFAR.

References

Banigbe, B., Audet, C. M., Okonkwo, P., Arije, O. O., Bassi, E., Clouse, K., ... & Ahonkhai, A. A. (2019). Effect of PEPFAR funding policy change on HIV service delivery in a large HIV care and treatment network in Nigeria. *PLoS One*, *14*(9), e0221809.

Chin, R. J., Sangmanee, D., & Piergallini, L. (2015). PEPFAR funding and reduction in HIV infection rates in 12 focus sub-Saharan African countries: a quantitative analysis. *International Journal of MCH and AIDS*, *3*(2), 150.

El-Sadr, W. M., Holmes, C. B., Mugyenyi, P., Thirumurthy, H., Ellerbrock, T., Ferris, R., ... & Whiteside, A. (2012). Scale-up of HIV treatment through PEPFAR: a historic public health achievement. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999)*, *60*(Suppl 3), S96.

Fauci, A. S., & Eisinger, R. W. (2018). PEPFAR—15 years and counting the lives saved. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *378*(4), 314-316.

Goosby, E., Von Zinkernagel, D., Holmes, C., Haroz, D., & Walsh, T. (2012). Raising the bar: PEPFAR and new paradigms for global health. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, *60*, S158-S162.

Katz, I. T., Bassett, I. V., & Wright, A. A. (2013). PEPFAR in transition—implications for HIV care in South Africa. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *369*(15), 1385-1387.

Kim, Y. (2022). The effectiveness of the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) in responding to HIV/AIDS in Four African Countries. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*.

Lee, M. M., & Izama, M. P. (2015). Aid externalities: evidence from PEPFAR in Africa. *World Development*, *67*, 281-294.

Menzies, N. A., Berruti, A. A., Berzon, R., Filler, S., Ferris, R., Ellerbrock, T. V., & Blandford, J. M. (2011). The cost of providing comprehensive HIV treatment in PEPFAR-supported programs. *AIDS (London, England)*, *25*(14), 1753.

Padian, N. S., Holmes, C. B., McCoy, S. I., Lyerla, R., Bouey, P. D., & Goosby, E. P. (2011). Implementation science for the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, *56*(3), 199-203.

Table 1: Summary Data by Year

The Total dollars spent (in millions) and fraction of total spending as by identified PEPFAR category for years 2005-2021. A total of $61.5 billion was identified in the data.

Year	Total Spending	Care & Treatment	Testing	Prevention	Socioeconomic	Above-Site, Program Management, Other
$ in millions						
2005	$ 1,069.5	$ 509.7	$ 96.4	$ 95.7	$ 95.2	$ 272.6
2006	$ 1,522.0	$ 796.1	$ 114.4	$ 124.7	$ 174.7	$ 312.1
2007	$ 2,556.8	$ 1,353.3	$ 223.2	$ 207.4	$ 289.5	$ 483.4
2008	$ 3,505.2	$ 1,786.9	$ 269.4	$ 295.0	$ 409.6	$ 744.2
2009	$ 3,553.4	$ 1,675.0	$ 265.1	$ 343.6	$ 387.8	$ 882.0
2010	$ 3,586.2	$ 1,686.5	$ 267.1	$ 350.4	$ 389.6	$ 892.5
2011	$ 3,693.6	$ 1,690.4	$ 336.6	$ 387.9	$ 398.3	$ 880.4
2012	$ 3,778.2	$ 1,662.4	$ 316.5	$ 425.1	$ 376.3	$ 997.8
2013	$ 3,191.5	$ 1,390.8	$ 272.6	$ 430.5	$ 266.7	$ 830.8
2014	$ 4,694.0	$ 1,541.9	$ 327.5	$ 391.2	$ 284.7	$ 2,148.8
2015	$ 3,979.8	$ 1,738.4	$ 253.6	$ 286.3	$ 234.8	$ 1,466.7
2016	$ 4,002.9	$ 2,062.0	$ 291.6	$ 302.2	$ 260.1	$ 1,087.0
2017	$ 3,990.5	$ 2,042.1	$ 238.2	$ 273.0	$ 254.8	$ 1,182.4
2018	$ 4,350.5	$ 2,040.2	$ 293.2	$ 338.9	$ 291.3	$ 1,386.8
2019	$ 4,539.5	$ 2,322.8	$ 286.0	$ 525.6	$ 325.3	$ 1,079.8
2020	$ 4,554.2	$ 1,778.0	$ 275.8	$ 454.9	$ 260.0	$ 1,785.6
2021	$ 4,909.5	$ 2,256.5	$ 278.3	$ 584.5	$ 321.6	$ 1,468.5
Total	**$ 61,477.3**	**$ 28,333.2**	**$ 4,405.4**	**$ 5,816.8**	**$ 5,020.6**	**$ 17,901.4**
Fraction of Total Spending						
2005	100.0%	47.7%	9.0%	8.9%	8.9%	25.5%
2006	100.0%	52.3%	7.5%	8.2%	11.5%	20.5%
2007	100.0%	52.9%	8.7%	8.1%	11.3%	18.9%
2008	100.0%	51.0%	7.7%	8.4%	11.7%	21.2%
2009	100.0%	47.1%	7.5%	9.7%	10.9%	24.8%
2010	100.0%	47.0%	7.4%	9.8%	10.9%	24.9%
2011	100.0%	45.8%	9.1%	10.5%	10.8%	23.8%
2012	100.0%	44.0%	8.4%	11.3%	10.0%	26.4%
2013	100.0%	43.6%	8.5%	13.5%	8.4%	26.0%
2014	100.0%	32.8%	7.0%	8.3%	6.1%	45.8%
2015	100.0%	43.7%	6.4%	7.2%	5.9%	36.9%
2016	100.0%	51.5%	7.3%	7.5%	6.5%	27.2%
2017	100.0%	51.2%	6.0%	6.8%	6.4%	29.6%
2018	100.0%	46.9%	6.7%	7.8%	6.7%	31.9%
2019	100.0%	51.2%	6.3%	11.6%	7.2%	23.8%
2020	100.0%	39.0%	6.1%	10.0%	5.7%	39.2%
2021	100.0%	46.0%	5.7%	11.9%	6.6%	29.9%
Total	**100.0%**	**46.1%**	**7.2%**	**9.5%**	**8.2%**	**29.1%**

Table 2: PEPFAR Spending and New HIV Infections (2005-2021)

Dependent variable in each regression is New HIV Infections per 1,000 people sourced from the World Health Organization. PEPFAR dollar spending by category is sourced from PEPFAR data and is scaled by population. All models include year and country fixed effects. Robust t-statistics clustered by country are reported in parentheses (***p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1)

	Total Funding	Care & Treatment	Testing	Prevention	Socioeconomic	Above-Site, Program Management, Other	All Spending Types Included
Total Spending	-0.119***						
	(-4.94)						
Care & Treatment		-0.205***					-0.239***
		(-3.28)					(-5.53)
Testing			-0.388				0.271
			(-0.91)				(1.60)
Prevention				-0.715***			-0.639***
				(-2.83)			(-3.29)
Socioeconomic					-0.470		0.825***
					(-1.29)		(4.68)
Other						-0.205***	-0.184***
						(-5.05)	(-5.76)
Constant	4.306***	4.430***	4.945***	4.653***	4.864***	4.851***	5.104***
	(10.72)	(8.43)	(8.59)	(14.03)	(13.74)	(15.23)	(20.88)
Observations	489	488	486	470	406	404	404
R-squared	0.653	0.595	0.461	0.606	0.531	0.587	0.780
Number of cc	47	47	47	47	40	40	40
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Table 3: PEPFAR Spending and New HIV Infections 2015-2021

Dependent variable in each regression is New HIV Infections per 1,000 people sourced from the World Health Organization. PEPFAR dollar spending by category is sourced from PEPFAR data and is scaled by population. All models include year and country fixed effects. Robust t-statistics clustered by country are reported in parentheses (***p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1)

	Total Funding	Care & Treatment	Testing	Prevention	Socioeconomic	Above-Site, Program Management, Other	All Spending Types Included
Total Spending	-0.140***						
	(-5.71)						
Care & Treatment		-0.157***					-0.094
		(-4.49)					(-1.42)
Testing			-0.639***				-0.233***
			(-8.00)				(-2.73)
Prevention				-0.547***			-0.146
				(-2.76)			(-1.16)
Socioeconomic					-0.944***		-0.390***
					(-7.43)		(-3.88)
Other						-0.081*	-0.085*
						(-1.89)	(-1.85)
Constant	3.139***	2.534***	2.404***	2.468***	3.174***	3.055***	3.759***
	(14.96)	(14.66)	(14.22)	(11.49)	(18.69)	(8.96)	(10.78)
Observations	233	232	232	227	177	176	176
R-squared	0.744	0.470	0.532	0.601	0.649	0.439	0.799
Number of cc	47	47	47	47	39	39	39
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Table 4: PEPFAR Spending and New HIV Infections 2005-2013

Dependent variable in each regression is New HIV Infections per 1,000 people sourced from the World Health Organization. PEPFAR dollar spending by category is sourced from PEPFAR data and is scaled by population. All models include year and country fixed effects. Robust t-statistics clustered by country are reported in parentheses (***p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1)

	Total Funding	Care & Treatment	Testing	Prevention	Socio-economic	Above-Site, Program Management, Other	All Spending Types Included
Total Spending	-0.093***						
	(-6.48)						
Care & Treatment		-0.136***					-0.096
		(-5.04)					(-1.18)
Testing			-0.388				0.395
			(-1.31)				(1.11)
Prevention				-0.801***			-0.730***
				(-6.98)			(-4.59)
Socioeconomic					-0.229		0.276**
					(-1.31)		(2.12)
Other						-0.274***	-0.110
						(-5.22)	(-1.59)
Constant	4.540***	4.672***	5.068***	4.755***	4.720***	4.863***	4.878***
	(23.58)	(13.10)	(13.74)	(28.13)	(22.77)	(26.87)	(27.10)
Observations	227	227	226	215	204	203	203
R-squared	0.666	0.577	0.526	0.738	0.537	0.648	0.770
Number of cc	29	29	29	29	28	28	28
Year FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Country FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES