

SEPTEMBER 2016

Costing of Norms-Shifting Interventions

A Primer from the Passages Project

RICK HOMAN, PhD – FHI 360



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Passages

Transforming Social Norms for
Sexual & Reproductive Health

© 2015 Institute for Reproductive Health, Georgetown University

Recommended Citation:

Costing of Norms-Shifting Interventions: A Primer from the Passages Project. September 2016. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Reproductive Health, Georgetown University for the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

This primer was prepared by Rick Homan, PhD of FHI 360 on behalf of the Institute for Reproductive Health at Georgetown University (IRH) under the Passages Project. This primer and the Passages Project are made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of the under Cooperative Agreement No. AID-OAA-A-15-00042. The contents are the responsibility of IRH and do not necessarily reflect the views of Georgetown University, USAID, or the United States Government.

Passages Project

Institute for Reproductive Health | Georgetown University
1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 699
Washington, DC 20009 USA

info@passagesproject.org

www.irh.org/projects/Passages

Twitter: @IRH_GU @Passages_Prject

Passages is applying implementation science principles to explain what makes interventions effective and sustainable at scale in real world contexts. Passages addresses socially complex issues such as gender inequality, stigma, and violence related to family planning and healthy timing and spacing while focusing on scalability, considering cost, complexity, and adaptability. This primer provides guidance on how to approach estimating the cost of norms-shifting interventions and the use of this information to promote sustainability and adaptation in other settings.

GLOSSARY

Annualization – technique for spreading the cost of an investment resource (such as equipment or a vehicle) across its expected useful life while also considering the opportunity cost of tying the money up in the investment

Average Cost – crude measure of efficiency, computed by dividing the total cost of an activity by the output of the activity (example: cost per person reached)

Financial Cost – cost that is tied to an expenditure of monetary resources

Marginal Cost – cost of increasing the total output of an activity by one unit (example: cost of reaching one more person), typically lower than average cost

Non-Financial Cost – cost that is tied to a resource for which no financial expenditure is required (example, using a room for a training at no charge)

Opportunity Cost – valuation of a resource that reflects the next best alternative use of a resource (example, time spent on activity A which means that Activity B cannot be pursued)

Shadow Price – technique for assigning a monetary value to a resource for which no financial transaction was required (example: what a room would cost to rent if it had not been available at no charge)

BACKGROUND

This primer is intended to be used as a resource to assist those who are implementing **norms-shifting** interventions in thinking through decisions that need to be made when assessing the cost of those interventions. The primer is organized around a process that may be used to generate a cost estimate and provides recommendations for key approaches to meet this objective. The information in this primer is based upon personal experience as well as discussions with other organizations that have worked on costing in general as well as costing of norms-shifting interventions. Detailed phone interviews with representatives from the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), Management Sciences for Health (MSH), Population Council, Save the Children, and Georgetown University's Institute for Reproductive Health (IRH) were used to identify approaches used in the past, what worked well, and where there were challenges. While no two analyses are implemented in exactly the same manner, the goals are often the same: to provide insight into the magnitude and type of investment that will be required to implement, sustain, and/or expand a norms-shifting intervention in a particular context. This primer intends to discuss the decisions that must be made when developing a cost estimate for a norms-shifting intervention and the pros and cons of different alternatives for developing the cost estimate. The latter sections will explore how this cost information can be used to support other types of analyses that may be relevant beyond the cost of the specific norms-shifting intervention being examined.

WHAT ARE COSTS?

Costs are the monetary expression of the value of resources required to obtain – or used to produce – a specific collection of goods or services. As such, the value of the resources is expected to vary with the source of the resources and the perspective of the person(s) assigning or assessing the value. For example, a child is likely to believe that the meals received at home have no “cost” i.e., are free. This is correct from their perspective, but from the parent's perspective that same meal has a cost in terms of actual financial expenditures to obtain ingredients, time and expenses consumed in growing ingredients, time and fuel costs for preparation of the meal, and the time costs associated with cleaning up after the meal. In this simple example, we can see how the same meal can be assigned very different “costs” depending upon perspective used (child vs. parent) and whether or not non-monetary costs are included or ignored (purchased vs. home-grown ingredients). Even the parents are unlikely to assign a cost to the tomatoes that were given by a neighbor and used in the preparation of the meal. The cost of growing these tomatoes were incurred by the neighbor. In this way, while we often speak about costs in absolute terms as if there is one number that is correct – often called a “price” – it is often the case that the correct value to consider will depend upon who is asking the question and the specific purpose for which this estimate is required.

HOW ARE COSTS MEASURED?

As mentioned above, costs are tied to resources. In our simple example, we described the process of gathering ingredients, processing the ingredients, serving and cleaning up after the meal. This activity-based approach is particularly useful as it helps to identify the resources required, how the resources are used and the process of combining/converting the resources into the finished product or service. It is our experience that people who are involved in the provision of a service or activity related to a norms-shifting intervention have an easier time describing how they do something than answering specific questions about what resources are used to support the norms-shifting intervention. Therefore, we recommend beginning with a semi-structured interview with the different groups who are or will be involved in the norms-shifting intervention.

Recommendation #1:

Begin a cost analysis by interviewing the groups who are implementing the norms-shifting intervention.

INTERVIEWING IMPLEMENTING GROUPS

The goal of the interview with program implementers is to understand how the intervention operates and to begin the identification of the resources that are used to support the intervention. Depending upon where the intervention is in the implementation process, you may be asking the respondents to describe what has already happened (retrospective) or what is planned to occur (prospective). Often times you will need to combine these two types of reports. A logic model can be a useful tool to assist in identifying the resources used to support a norms-shifting intervention. It is also useful to organize your notes around specific phases of the norms-shifting intervention. The table below provides a template that can be used to organize the information gathered from these interviews. The table has been populated with examples of the types of data to be captured for a norms-shifting intervention.

Information to be Captured on Norms-Shifting Interventions by Phase

| Phase | Inputs | Process | Outputs |
|--|--|--|--|
| Designing the Intervention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time from sponsoring organization • Consultants / content experts • Staff time from partner organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of literature • In-person / virtual meetings with content experts • In-person / virtual meetings with partner organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned structure of the intervention and guide for implementation • Training materials for program implementers • Job aids for program implementers • Support materials for use with recipients |
| Negotiation / Adaptation to Local Context | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time from sponsoring organization • Consultants / content experts • Staff time from partner organizations • Staff time from key stakeholder groups • Community representatives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person / virtual meetings • Visits to intended implementation sites • Identification of potential local implementing partner(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of baseline or current social norms • Signed MOU with key stakeholders and implementing partners • Adaptation of job aids and training curriculum for program implementers • Detailed timeline and logistics plan to support program implementation |
| Preparing for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time from sponsor organization, implementation partners, key stakeholders, and experts • Training venue and conference package | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training of local implementing partner staff • Securing support from local stakeholder groups • Orientation to monitoring tools to be used during implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production of finalized job aids and support material for use during implementation • Finalized logistics plan for program implementation |
| Implementation of the Intervention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time from implementing partner(s) • Other materials / supplies used to deliver the intervention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities with target group(s) for implementation • Media or other SBCC activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on activities conducted and persons reached with intervention |

When using this type of table in interviews with program implementers, the inputs column is useful for identifying the specific resources that are being used to support the intervention during various phases. The goal is to identify the specific resources used (the what) and the source of the individual resources (who provided). In the process column, the goal is to describe the activities that took place or are planned to take place as the intervention is introduced (how resources were used). Finally, the outputs column is useful to identify any existing program documentation that can be used later in the costing process to gain further information from resource providers.

TIMING OF COST ANALYSIS

When planning a cost analysis, it is helpful to consider whether or not to collect resource use information retrospectively or prospectively. While the retrospective collection has an advantage of being able to focus on what has already happened, it can suffer from recall bias for activities that were not well documented when they occurred. The prospective data collection allows for more precision in the cost estimate but can impose an additional reporting burden on implementing partners depending upon the level of detail requested. In practice, the design, planning, negotiating, and preparing phases are often assessed retrospectively and the actual implementation phase is assessed prospectively.

The table below summarizes alternatives to consider when undertaking prospective or retrospective data collection for labor resources. We focus on labor resources here. Many of the costs for norms-shifting interventions are tied to labor, as these interventions are often quite labor intensive and require repeat one-on-one or one-on-few interactions with those persons whose norms the program is trying to influence.

When attempting to capture time of labor resources, don't forget to include the time of volunteers or donated/redeployed time in your measurement, as this resource is clearly being used to support the intervention (as were the tomatoes from the neighbor in the example above).

While direct observation may be considered the "gold standard" it is not without its limitations. In addition to the extra cost required to capture the information, the information that is being captured may not be an accurate reflection of what happens once the observer is removed; however, we can predict the direction of bias (longer, slower, more deliberate encounters with intervention recipients) so it can provide an upper limit on time requirements for the intervention. Timesheets and encounter logs (when complete) are also likely to be upwardly biased. An alternative would be to "back calculate" encounter times from time spent in the field and number of persons-reached or contacted as a check on any self-reported data. Finally, an external benchmark or norm for how long a specific activity or encounter should take could be used if one exists based upon prior experience with the intervention.

A note on timing of cost analysis

As we've seen, the data required for a cost analysis may be collected retrospectively or prospectively. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages. The retrospective collection has an advantage of being able to document what has actually happened but can suffer from recall bias for activities that were not well documented. Prospective data collection can obtain more precise information but introduces an additional reporting burden on program implementers to document resource use in greater detail.

Alternative Techniques for Capturing Labor Resource Utilization

| Timing | Technique | Pros | Cons |
|----------------------|--|--|---|
| Prospective | Direct observation (e.g., time motion study) | Most precise approach | Can be intrusive; observation bias can change behavior of person(s) being observed; most expensive |
| Prospective | Activity sampling | Reasonably accurate and less intrusive than direct observation | Can bias observed behaviors; costly to implement |
| Prospective | Self-report / timesheet | Easy to implement | Subject to rounding and recall bias; can give illusion of precision and may get “modal” response; can quickly create mountain of data with a large staff |
| Prospective | Encounter logs with start and stop times | Easy to implement | Often creates non-random sample as some encounters not logged; bias unknown |
| Retrospective | Self-report / Estimation | Easy to implement | Accuracy improved if tied to specific activities that are relatively self-contained (one-time meetings) or homogeneous if repeated (e.g., structured sessions with target audience) |

Fortunately, the prospective data collection of the non-labor resources is less prone to reporting or measurement bias and is generally quite robust. Often a simple log form for any meetings, or sessions with intervention recipients noting date, time, location, number of people contacted, and any supplies (including refreshments or transport reimbursements) or equipment used will suffice and this information is easily obtained.

One approach that has been used successfully in the past is to introduce a monthly “intervention tracking tool” (see appendix) which implementing partners use to document the process of implementation in more detail. That information can then be used to facilitate the activity-based costing described below.

Recommendation #2:

When trying to capture costing information prospectively, an intervention tracking tool can be a useful device to capture details on how the intervention is being implemented.

ACTIVITY-BASED COSTING

Once the interviews with program implementers have been completed, the analyst should have an understanding of how the norms-shifting intervention operates and the key activities that were/will be involved in implementation of the intervention. We recommend using an activity-based costing approach to organize the information collected and guide the development of the cost estimate

Recommendation #3:

Activity-based costing provides a useful approach to organize information from the implementer interviews and guides the development of the cost estimate.

Step 1: Identify Resources Used for Each Activity Identified within a Phase

The information captured from the interviews with implementers can now be reorganized into a spreadsheet with sections or sheets organized around phases and/or specific activities. For each activity, you will want to list the resources that were identified in the interview and the source of the resource. Additionally, you will want to document whether or not the resource was purchased by the program and if not purchased, if it was donated or redeployed (see appendix).

Step 2: Measure Quantity of Each Resource Used in Natural Units

Rather than directly assign a value to each resource used, it is helpful to document the quantity of each resource required to support specific activities within the intervention. This level of detail can become important in other applications of costing where changes in either the quantity of resources or the unit value for a resource may need to be adjusted.

Resources should be measured in their natural units (time spent either person-hours or -days for labor, pieces or units for supplies, operating-hours or -days for equipment, meeting-hours or -days for meetings or trainings, field-days for site visits, etc.) whenever possible.

You may have obtained some information on quantities of resources required during the information interview with implementers. If not, you'll need to contact the supplier of each resource and ask them to identify the quantity of each resource that was used (retrospective report) or the quantity expected to be used (prospective report) for the key activities. An example of a general resource documentation framework – which includes a place to document quantity used – can be found in the appendix.

Recommendation #4:

Whenever possible, measure resource use in natural units.

Step #3: Assign a Unit Value to Each Resource Used

Once resources have been documented and quantities used have been identified, we will need to assign a unit value to each resource. Initially, this unit value should reflect the “cost” or value to the resource provider. Important exceptions to this approach occur in two instances:

- 1) For donated or in-kind inputs for which no financial transaction occurs (such as volunteer labor, or a meeting space provided at no charge to the intervention), these resources should still be assigned a value as the intervention would not be possible without these resources. In this case a “shadow price,” or what it would cost to obtain this resource or an equivalent resource if this one were not available at no cost, should be used. For example, if you could not get a volunteer to undertake an activity supporting the intervention, what would you need to pay someone to take on this duty? For donated space, the value would be assigned based upon what it would cost to rent such a space for the time required.
- 2) For capital investments or resources that have an expected useful life greater than one year, their estimated cost of their use should be “annualized” to reflect the portion of the total cost consumed by the intervention. For example, if a vehicle with a replacement cost of \$35,000 is used for 120 days we would want to spread the value of this resource across its useful life. If we assume this vehicle will be able to be kept running for 15 years, then we can compute an annualization factor at a 3% discount rate¹, which if multiplied by the replacement cost of \$35,000 gives an annualized cost of \$2,931.83, and if multiplied by 120 days use/365.25 days per year, gives us a value of \$963.23 for the use of this vehicle. Notice that the full annualized cost of \$2,931.83 is greater than the replacement cost of \$35,000 divided by 15 years of expected useful life (\$2,333.33) and this is because the annualization factor takes into account that money spent on a vehicle is no longer available for other potential uses. This is consistent with the economist’s notion of opportunity costs which considers both the financial and non-financial value of a resource.

For other resources, we are likely to be able to find some documentation of the unit value either from budget documents, purchasing logs, or receipts maintained by the program. However, the two cases discussed above highlight why one must be careful to not just run to the accounts office to try to identify the cost of a norms-shifting intervention. The accounts office will only have data on the resources they have sourced and for which a financial transaction occurred. As a result, capital investments will be overstated and any resources for which a financial transaction did not occur (or which were obtained by other parties) will be overlooked.

Recommendation #5:

Do not rely upon the accounts office to provide complete information on the cost of a norms-shifting intervention.

¹ The annualization factor formula is: $a(r, n) = \frac{r}{1 - (1+r)^{-n}}$ where r is the discount rate and n is the expected useful life in this case $r = 0.03$ and $n = 15$ so $a(r, n) = 0.08376658$.

Step #4: Aggregate Resources Used Multiplied by Unit Cost across All Resources by Activity and Phase of the Intervention

Once you have estimates of the resources used, the quantity used, and appropriate unit costs, you can multiply quantity times unit cost to get cost per resource and aggregate across resources to get cost for an activity, or across activities to get cost per phase, or across phases to get cost for the norms-shifting intervention. This result is now the base case estimate for the value of resources or “cost” used to implement the norms-shifting intervention. This information can then be used to answer a series of programmatically relevant questions as described below. An example of an activity-specific cost estimate can be found in the appendix.

REPORTING THE RESULTS OF COST ESTIMATION

When reporting the results of the cost estimation it is useful to consider the intended audience. As mentioned at the beginning of this primer, what something “costs” will depend upon the perspective of the audience. The process outlined above is intended to result in a “fully loaded” cost estimate but there are many instances when that result is not what is being sought or is not relevant to the decision-maker. Therefore, this may require adjusting how the information is presented so that the different potential audiences are able to obtain the information that is most relevant to them.

For example, one goal may be to provide a cost estimate for others who might be interested in conducting a similar intervention. In this case it will be most useful to report on the costs of activities by phase of the intervention (though oftentimes the design and the negotiation/adaptation phase cost estimates are excluded). The design phase costs are often excluded because the materials that were developed are now readily available and the wheel does not need to be reinvented. The negotiation/adaptation costs are often omitted with the understanding that these costs are highly context specific and therefore not generalizable. However, if these costs are excluded, it is important to emphasize that what is being presented are the operational costs of the program or intervention and not the full value of resources used to implement the program.

Another advantage of presenting activity-specific cost estimates by phase is that it can assist in budgeting in support of the activities, as well as planning for the timing and sequencing of activities. This is particularly relevant if a goal is to support sustaining or scaling-up / replicating the intervention (see next section). If there are specific activities that are start-up or one-time investments as opposed to on-going recurring costs, that distinction can also be important to provide. A third-party may be willing to assist with the start-up costs but will look for local resource sources for the on-going costs to keep an intervention running.

Cost results are sometimes presented with disaggregation by source of resources or by financial costs vs. non-financial costs². As discussed above in the valuation section, not all resources will require a

² Full economic costs reflect the summation of both financial and non-financial costs and will be used whenever a social perspective is being used for the analysis.

financial transaction (as in cases of donated inputs or in-kind resources) but we still want to assign a monetary value to these resources since they are used to support the intervention. For example, if a staff member adjusts how she spends her time in order to support the intervention, there is no change in total payroll costs, but the time she spends on the intervention is time that is not available for other activities. In this case, the value is her equivalent fully-loaded hourly rate, but this cost is a non-financial cost (and in this case an opportunity cost) to the organization through which she is employed. The same would occur for the use of vehicles which are already owned or physical space which already exists. By highlighting the full value of resources and then separating out the financial from the non-financial costs, some of the “sticker shock” of an intervention can be reduced and can also assist in negotiations with collaborating government or non-governmental bodies who may be asked to provide in-kind support to an intervention. (See appendix for an example).³

Finally, the analyst needs to consider what currency unit will be used for the presentation of results. For an in-country presentation, local currency units should be used. For an international audience, US dollars is often used as a default. Exceptions to this would be if the funder/donor uses a non-dollar currency, in which case that currency unit should be used.

Recommendation #6:

Present cost estimates with sufficient detail to facilitate anticipated use. At a minimum, estimates should be disaggregated by activity. A distinction between (one-time) start-up and recurring costs can also be useful for planning purposes.

SECONDARY COST ANALYSES FOR NORMS-SHIFTING INTERVENTIONS

What is the cost per person reached by the intervention? – Value for Money Proposition

Perhaps the simplest use of the result obtained in step 4 above would be to divide the total estimated cost by the number of persons reached by the intervention. This result yields an estimated cost of reaching an individual with the package of services including the costs of designing, negotiating/adapting, preparing, and implementing the intervention. This is a crude measure of programmatic efficiency which is perhaps useful for monitoring performance within a program over time as opposed to comparisons across programs. Note that except for the costs in the implementation phase, this estimate would not be a useful metric for estimating the cost of reaching one more person with the intervention, as most of the costs in the earlier phases can be thought of

³ The identification of whether or not a resource will be reported as a financial or non-financial cost will be determined during the resource identification and valuation steps above. If a resource is identified as being provided at no financial cost to the program or if it is a resource that is provided in-kind by a partner, then the value of that resource would be reported under the non-financial cost heading. This is different than a cost analysis from a transaction perspective in which case those resources which do not require financial outlays would all be assigned a value of zero.

fixed or less sensitive to the scale of the intervention. Depending upon the actual content of the intervention (e.g., a mass media centric approach), the average cost of the implementation phase of the program may not reflect the cost of reaching one more person (the marginal cost), as there are likely to be scale effects associated with the intervention. For this purpose we would actually want to estimate a cost function which is beyond the scope of this primer.

What is the cost of sustaining or scaling-up/replicating the intervention?

Often, especially if there is evidence that the norms-shifting intervention has had a positive impact, there will be interest in making sure that the intervention is sustained, or in expanding its current locale (scaling-up), or transferring to another locale (replication). The challenge with these types of analysis is deciding what will change between the intervention as observed in the costing exercise and what will happen in the future scenarios. Potential changes to consider include:

1) *What activities will need to be repeated in the future scenario?*

For example, the design of the intervention may or may not be modified depending upon satisfaction with the current version. Similarly, if staying within the current locale there may be no need to negotiate/adapt the intervention but these activities would likely need to be repeated if brought to a different locale. With respect to preparing for implementation, if additional or replacement staff from the implementing partner(s) need to be trained, these costs would be incurred but there may be potential economies of scale from larger training sessions which could reduce the cost per person trained if the program is operating at scale. Finally, it is likely that the cost for implementation of the intervention could require adjustment depending upon whether there are likely to be efficiency gains (easier to reach the target population) or efficiency losses (harder to reach the target population) as the intervention expands within existing locales or moves to additional locales.

2) *Will the components of the intervention remain unchanged in the future scenario?*

Based upon lessons learned in the implementation which was costed, are there activities that should be modified or excluded? Or new activities to include in some phases? As the nature of the intervention changes over time, the resource requirements – and therefore the cost of the intervention – will also change over time. This will require adjustments to the resource list or the quantity of resources used from the initial cost estimate. For example, the supervision of the intervention in the future scenarios may be less intensive than in the scenario costed. The resources required for this activity would therefore be reduced in the future scenario.

3) *Will the sources of resources remain the same in the future scenario?*

If resources will come from different sources in the future scenario, then the unit costs used in the initial cost estimate may need to be adjusted to reflect the new cost per unit of the resource. For example, resources from an international NGO may be replaced with resources from a local government body and we would expect these resources to have different unit cost as they are coming from a different source. If we expect there to be quality differences

associated with the resources as the source shifts this may also require adjusting the units required in the future scenarios.

4) *Are there resources that already exist that will be redeployed or used to support the intervention?*

If there are resources already in place that can be used to support the intervention, this can be considered an “opportunity” rather than a financial cost of the intervention. This can be important to consider when the focus is on resource mobilization, as it is only the incremental cost of additional resources that will need to be covered.

How cost-effective is the intervention?

While a complete discussion of cost-effectiveness analysis is beyond the scope of this primer, it merits at least a mention as the term “cost-effectiveness” is often misused. Cost-effectiveness is a relative term like hot or cold, tall or short, and therefore requires a comparison to some other reasonable alternative. That reasonable alternative may be the absence of the intervention (status quo) or a streamlined or augmented version of the current intervention. In either case, because the cost-effectiveness measure is comprised of two elements, cost and effectiveness, both elements must be measured for the intervention being evaluated and for the alternative(s). If the alternative is the status quo, then the fully-loaded cost of the intervention will be sufficient; otherwise, detailed costing of the comparator will be required. In addition, a common measure of effectiveness and a common metric for costs are needed across the alternatives being compared (see sidebar).

This can be problematic for norms-shifting interventions, as it is often hard to agree on a single measure of effectiveness as the interventions are often multi-dimensional. For example, an intervention may seek to change attitudes towards social equality and increase opportunities for young women. Summarizing this in a single metric is difficult if not impossible. If a single effectiveness measure is not feasible, the costs would need to be disaggregated to the different components and that is likely to be highly subjective.

A note on cost reporting

When deciding what currency unit to use when reporting cost one should consider what is most relevant to the intended audience. If the audience is primarily local stakeholders, the local currency should be used. If the audience is primarily international, US dollars are often used as a default. One can use the prevailing exchange rates during the time of the intervention to convert between the two currencies. If an intervention spans countries, then one will need to use purchasing power parity adjustments to combine data across multiple countries.

In addition to these measurement challenges, one also has to take great care to assure that a fair comparison is being made. It will be important to “standardize” the interventions to reflect programs reaching the same size target populations; the estimation of costs must reflect the same phases of the interventions; and use a common perspective when assigning a value to the resources. Cost-effectiveness analyses are often conducted from the social perspective so as to be as inclusive as possible and to assure that all financial and non-financial costs are being considered. The alternatives being considered are rank-ordered with respect to increasing total cost of the interventions, and

the total costs are divided by the corresponding measure(s) of total effectiveness. The alternative with the lowest total cost serves as the comparator and the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio is determined by computing the change in total cost divided by the change in total effectiveness (incremental cost-effectiveness ratio). If an alternative shows a reduction in total effectiveness compared to a less expensive alternative, that alternative is removed from consideration (more expensive but less effective). If the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio is greater compared to a more expensive alternative, that alternative is removed from consideration (said to be dominated). Of those alternatives that remain, the decision maker is left to decide if the gain in effectiveness is worth the required additional investment.

A final word of caution is that even if an intervention can be shown to be cost-effective compared to an alternative, the finding of cost-effectiveness is not a guarantee of affordability of the intervention.

SUMMARY

This has been a short overview of the key concepts and recommended approaches to develop a cost estimate for norms-shifting interventions. As should be clear, while we can develop a fairly standardized approach to developing a cost estimate, there are many decisions that need to be made along the way with respect to how resources will be measured and valued, and the answers to these decisions will be influenced by the context in which the analysis takes place and the underlying question that is trying to be answered. As convenient as it is to think of cost as being some sort of absolute truth or constant, the result obtained will be sensitive to the perspective being used, whether costs are captured prospectively or retrospectively, whether full economic costs or only financial costs are considered, and what phases of the intervention process are included in the analysis. The key is to document the decisions made along the way in developing the cost estimate so that a reviewer can correctly interpret the results, what has been included, how it has been valued, and what has been excluded from the analysis and why that is appropriate.

APPENDICES

Example of Intervention Tracking Tool

INTERVENTION TRACKING TOOL

Project Title – Implementing Partner Org.

Name(s) of person(s) reporting: _____

Name of study: _____

Reporting Month: _____ Date completed: _____

Description of intervention, components and planned activities (use as much space as needed):

Insert SOW for the implementing partner (this section stays unchanged from month to month)

| A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intervention components and planned activities | Activities as actually implemented (Description, including process used to achieve activity) | Names of Individuals/Organizations Involved and their Role | Considerations for Future Replication or Expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What successes occurred during this reporting period? • What challenges were encountered and what strategies employed to address them? • If the intervention was not implemented as planned, briefly describe why. • What else occurred which was not originally anticipated as part of the intervention but proved to be important (either positive or negative)? | Activity to be replicated during scale up? Yes/No |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Please provide any attachments for additional detail (training or site visit reports, meeting minutes, etc.)

Comments: *Use this section to reiterate or expand upon anything that the team feels is particularly important from the month's/quarter's review.*

Proposed workplan for next month:

Example of Activity Based Costing Resource Documentation Framework for an Activity

| Resource Documentation Framework | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|---|
| Activity: | | | | | | |
| | | | Used for this Activity | | | |
| Resource Category | Resource Description (list each item separately and add lines if needed) | Provider of Resource | Quantity | Units | Purchased by Program (Y/N) | <i>If not purchased, donated or re-deployed from other use?</i> |
| Labor | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Supplies | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Equipment | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Transport | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Venue | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Example of Activity Based Costing Estimation Framework for an Activity⁴

| Sensitization of the community | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------|------|---------|-----------------|------------------|
| Sensitization at County Level ***Fill in blue shaded area*** | | | | | | |
| Resource | Unit | Type | Unit | Type | Unit Cost (KES) | Total Cost (KES) |
| Staff time (spent during activity) | | | | | | |
| CHEW | | Persons | | hrs | 150.52 | 0 |
| CHWs | | Persons | | hrs | 5.00 | 0 |
| Peer Educators (local NGOs) | | Persons | | hrs | 10.00 | 0 |
| Total staff costs | | | | | Total time = | 0 |
| Travel (for MOH staff going to HC for Pre-Assessment) | | | | | | |
| Daily Travel Allowance for CHEW (transit & lunch allowance) | | day | | trip | 850.00 | 0 |
| Writing materials | | persons | | set | 35.00 | 0 |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Mobile phone minutes () | | Calls | | minutes | 4.00 | 0 |
| | | | | | Total Other = | 0 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | 0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Sensitization at Community Level ***Fill in blue shaded area*** | | | | | | |
| Resource | Unit | Type | Unit | Type | Unit Cost (KES) | Total Cost (KES) |
| Staff time (spent during activity) | | | | | | |
| CHEW | | Persons | | hrs | 150.52 | 0 |
| CHWs | | Persons | | hrs | 5.00 | 0 |
| Peer Educators (local NGOs) | | Persons | | hrs | 10.00 | 0 |
| Total staff costs | | | | | Total time = | 0 |
| Travel (for MOH staff going to HC for Pre-Assessment) | | | | | | |
| Daily Travel Allowance for CHEW (transit & lunch allowance) | | day | | trip | 100.00 | 0 |
| Writing materials | | persons | | set | 10.00 | 0 |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Mobile phone minutes () | | Calls | | minutes | 4.00 | 0 |
| | | | | | Total Other = | 0 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | 0 |

⁴ CHEW- Community Health Extension Worker; CHW- Community Health Workers; MOH- Ministry of Health; HC- Health Center; NGO- Non-Governmental Organization; KES- Kenyan Shilling

Example of Results Highlighting Differences by Level and Financial vs. Non-Financial Costs⁵

| Intervention Activity components | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--------|--------|---------|
| County Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resource Requirements (KSh.) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | Financial | Non-Financial | | | | | | Total | Fin | Non-Fin |
| 69,931 | 36,759 | 33,172 | Site Assessment of on-going integration activities, infrastructure, human resource skill sets & sensitization of staff | | | | | 11.2% | 12.8% | 9.8% |
| 4,696 | 970 | 3,726 | Sensitization of the community | | | | | 0.7% | 0.3% | 1.1% |
| 59,798 | 23,459 | 36,339 | Development site workplan | | | | | 9.5% | 8.2% | 10.7% |
| 330,663 | 169,740 | 160,923 | Provider Capacity Building | | | | | 52.8% | 59.2% | 47.3% |
| 161,561 | 55,746 | 105,814 | Supervision of Implementation (additional to regular supervision) | | | | | 25.8% | 19.4% | 31.1% |
| 626,649 | 286,674 | 339,975 | TOTAL | | | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | 45.7% | 54.3% | | | | | | | | |
| Community Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resource Requirements (KSh.) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | Financial | Non-Financial | | | | | | Total | Fin | Non-Fin |
| 65,879 | 37,160 | 28,719 | Site Assessment of on-going integration activities, infrastructure, human resource skill sets & sensitization of staff | | | | | 22.4% | 31.7% | 16.3% |
| 2,124 | 220 | 1,904 | Sensitization of the community | | | | | 0.7% | 0.2% | 1.1% |
| 57,285 | 14,060 | 43,225 | Development site workplan | | | | | 19.5% | 12.0% | 24.5% |
| 94,930 | 41,477 | 53,453 | Provider Capacity Building | | | | | 32.3% | 35.4% | 30.3% |
| 73,243 | 24,240 | 49,003 | Supervision of Implementation (additional to regular supervision) | | | | | 25.0% | 20.7% | 27.8% |
| 293,461 | 117,157 | 176,304 | TOTAL | | | | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| | 39.9% | 60.1% | | | | | | | | |

⁵ KSh- Kenyan Shilling