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Abstract

Introduction The lack of transparency in prioritization of health services, multiple health insurance organizations with various and not-aligned policies, plus limited resources to provide comprehensive health coverage are among the challenges to design appropriate Health Insurance benefit Package (HIBP) in Iran.

Method data collection was done through semi-structured interviews with 25 experts, plus document analysis and observation, from February 2014 until October 2016. Using both deductive and inductive approaches, two independent researchers analyzed data and used MAXQDA.11 software for data management.

Results We identified 10 main themes, plus 81 sub-themes related to development and implementation of BP, including: lack of transparent criteria for inclusion of services within BP, inadequate use of scientific evidences in determination of BP, lack of evaluation systems, and weak decision-making process. We propose 11 solutions and 25 policy options to improve the situation.

Discussion Design and implementation of HIBP did not follow evidence-based and logical algorithm in Iran. Rather, political and financial influences at the macro level determined the decisions. This is rooted in social, cultural and economic norms in the country, whereby political and economic factors have the greatest impact on the implementation of HIBP.

Conclusion To define a cost-effective HIBP in Iran, it is pivotal to develop transparent and evidence-based guidelines about the processes and the stewardship of BP, which are in line with upstream policies and societal characteristics. Worse still, the possible conflict of interests and its harms need to be minimized in advance.

Introduction

Different types of health systems use various priority setting mechanisms to define their health benefit package (BP), namely the health-care services covered by the government. For instance, the National Health Services –NHS- in the United Kingdom covers almost all services provided by public healthcare centres that are affiliated with the Department of Health (1, 2). Whereas, the National Health Insurance- NHI- systems in Germany develop Basic Benefit Packages (BP) and restrict
compensations to defined services that are included in the BP (s) (3). Based on its health system, each country has its own mechanism of priority setting for policy coverage, through which a list or lists of services under insurance coverage, so-called BP(s) are developed (4, 5).

By definition, developing a BP means prioritizing healthcare services based on pre-defined indicators, taking economic, clinical and socio-political factors into consideration (6). Low-middle income countries face many challenges and difficulties in the process of efficient and cost-effective development of a BP. Similar to other settings, the health system in Iran faces a series of challenges to development and implementation processes of BP, i.e., lack of shared perspectives among policymakers, insufficient transparent prioritizing criteria, duplicate organizational structures and unsustainable resources (7, 8). The decision to enter a service to the package begins with the agenda of that service during the meetings of the Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Health Insurance (SCHI). The decisions have been traditionally taken based on the bargaining power of the parties during the meetings. The bargaining power of insurance companies, mainly taking into account the financial burden of services.

Developing a BP is both politically hierarchical and largely contextual, and is associated with health system structure, budget and technical capacity of the stakeholders (5). Hence, no universal method exists to fit all health systems. This study aims to investigate the policy processes of developing and implementing the HIBP in Iran. We will propose evidence-informed policy options to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the current BP. Using policy process (as one of the four dimensions of policy: content, process, stakeholders and content) analysis, this article attempts to answer the following questions: how to identify problems that are related to the development and implementation of the BP; who is engaged in policy development; how to develop a BP-related policy; how to formalize policies that are related to the BP; how to implement these policies (BP development, making decisions process of BP); and, finally, how to evaluate the BP.

Methods
This is a qualitative research that used both retrospective (policy analysis) and prospective (analysis for policy) approaches to investigate the policy-making process of the BP in Iran. Data collection and
Analysis was conducted from February 2014 until October 2016 during two consecutive phases (Figure 1):

Phase 1: Retrospective policy process analysis of BP: We investigated four dimensions of the policy process: agenda setting, policy development, policy implementation, and evaluation. We collected data through: semi-structured interviews with 25 experts (Appendix 1) in the field of insurance and health economics (i.e. academics and field staff, high level managers and policy makers affiliated to the Ministry of Health and Medical Education (MoHME), the Ministry of Cooperatives, Labour, and Social Welfare (MoCLSW)), document analysis and observation (participating in the meetings of HCHI Secretariat.

Semi-structured interviews, using a generic topic guide, were our main data collection method (Appendix 2). These issues were investigated during the interviews: how development of a BP was included in the MoHME agenda? How BP-related policies were developed (or are being developed)? The extent to which the BP development was evidence-based? What mechanisms were used to attract policy-makers attention to the BP-related problems? How BP-related policies are being implemented? Is there an evaluation and revision process to the BP? What instruments and solutions are using for revising the BP?

In addition, we investigated laws, instructions and contents of various protocols that were related to the BP. To collect and categorize legal documents, in addition to MAXQDA software, we also developed an information worksheet (Appendix 3). Finally, some of us (EM, AO), as observers, participated in selected HCHI’s meeting (5 sessions in 15 hours), during which the BP was discussed, so we could directly observe the decision-making process, stakeholders’ engagement, and the influence making. All discussions and the researcher’s perceptions were recorded.

All interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. We used an inductive thematic content analysis approach (Eloo 2007) for data analysis and categorized the themes using MAXQDA.11 software.

Phase 2: Prospective policy-options analysis: We followed a four steps policy option analysis model (9) to draw evidence-informed policy options about the issues and challenges of developing the BP:
problem identification: The finding of phase one helped us identify and list the issues and challenges of each dimension.

evidence collection: We collected scientific evidences for each identified issue through following methods: comprehensive review of valid databases; experts’ opinions that were extracted from interviews; rationales extracted from investigating process; and document review and observations from the HCHI’s Secretariat meetings. We used MESH and Freetexts approaches to search valid databases. For this purpose, the most important medical electronic databases including the Cochrane, Pubmed and Scopus were searched (2000-March 2016).
prioritizing and policy options evaluation: after collecting evidences and primary development of policy options, we convened a panel of professionals to prioritize the policy options. All identified options were evaluated in terms of feasibility and necessity.
proposing final solutions to achieve evidence-informed and prioritized policy options: finally, we developed a summary of final solutions in the form of policy options.

Results
First, we present the findings of our retrospective qualitative analysis of the BP policies, and then will move to the results of policy options analysis.

Our analysis identified four main issues (agenda setting, policy development, policy implementation, and evaluation), 10 themes and 78 sub-themes, as presented in Table 1.

Agenda setting: We used Kingdon multistream model (10) to identify issues related to problem stream, Politics stream, and Policies stream. In addition, 12 extra sub-themes were identified.

Problem stream
There was a constantly increasing demand for healthcare services due to the epidemiological transition. This led to increasing health expenditures, which in turn revealed the importance of developing a BP. During the course of past four decades, a series of policies have been developed and implemented in Iran that show the neccessity of developing basic health insurance package (e.g. the National Health Insurance Act of 1995, Supreme’s leader mega policies for health, and instruction of strategic purchasing):

"Resource scarcity has always been an important problem for BP and, therefore, insurers always are trying to avoid implementing the BP..." (R 12).

Policy stream
Until now, no practical policy or scientific method has been developed to determine the implementation path of macro policies related to the BP in Iran. Issues such as lack of scientific ceiteria or evidences to develop or revise the BP and ignoring the epidemiological transition have led this problem to be revealed:
“Currently, our problem is that we mistakenly consider the BP as strategic purchasing, but it must be mentioned which services are covered, based on what evidences and for whom, and why this package should be bought, what criteria should be used, I mean, why a service should be included in the BP” (R 26).

Politics stream
In addition to political support to BP that were endorsed by the sequential National Development Plans, Supreme leader’s mega policies for health of 2013 was a turning point in providing political support for the BP. The mega policies attracted more attention to the health sector and led more funds to be allocated towards health:

“In the eleventh government, government attention to the health sector problems and challenges significantly increased and still continues” (R 11).

Our investigation showed that BP-related policies have been always developing, but never the three streams of problem, policy, and politics came together. Lack of systematic revision and approach to the BP resulted in inadequate growth of policies stream, which in turn led to the policy window never opened.

Policy development: two main themes (stewardship of policy making, and method and trend of decision-making) and 15 sub-themes were identified here.

Steward of the policy making
We identified 65 documents containing various policies that were directly and indirectly related to the BP. The most obvious one is Article 29 of the constitution, which endorses social security as a right for all citizens:

“Having social security, in terms of retirement, unemployment, elderly, inability to work, orphanage, financial needs, accidents, health-care services and medical care, is a universal right for all Iranians” (Article 29 of the constitution).

The MoHME is in charge of drafting health sector policies, while the MoCLSW contributes to developing the draft policies related to the BP. The MoHME is also responsible to get the policy approval in liaison with four levels: The HCHI Secretariat, the cabinet, parliament, and supreme leader’s office.

Methods and trends of decision-making
Health insurance, health system financing and BP-related issues were endorsed by the third NDP for the first time in Iran, which repeated in the following NDPs and OHPs, while, no organized decision-making process was designed to implement such a policy. Therefore, consensus making by officials and policy-makers (negotiation style) were used to define the BP, where bargaining power had (and still has) an important role in influencing decisions. This has led to lack of transparency and determined tasks, resulting in a weak stewardship for BP-related policies:

“A serious problem occurs in the system ... because of bargaining power of some policy-makers, some services won’t be included in the BP, while some unnecessary services are included, and it’s a serious problem in IHS” (R 6).

Policy implementation: two main themes: policy implementation timeline and the process of BP implementation, plus 38 subthemes were identified here.

Policy implementation timeline
Implementation and revisions of BP-related policies can be categorized into five time periods: before 1993, 1994 to 2003, 2004 to 2006, 2007 to 2014, and after 2014. Time periods were categorized based on changes in the content of the package, decision-making method, and the stewardship of decision-making. Before 1993 and the enactment of the Universal Health Insurance Act (UHIA), health laws were mainly focused on service coverage, whilst there was no comprehensive document to define which services to be covered by which health insurance organization.

In 1993, by enactment of the UHIA and the establishment of the HCHI Secretariat, health insurance policies became more coherent. The HCHI Secretariat was initially affiliated with the MoHME and held meetings, mostly attended by the representatives of various health insurance organizations, plus the Iranian Medical Association (IMA), to make decisions about inclusion and/or exclusion of medical services in the BP. Indeed, there were no expert debates to make such decisions.

In 2004, the HCHI Secretariat was transferred to the newly established MoCLSW. During this period, the decision criteria to include new services were frequency and utilization patterns, which were based on the insurance organizations’ reports. In 2007, the biggest change occurred in the BP governance, when the HCHI Secretariat began to uniform the BP among all health insurance organization. All covered services were published in a book, called “basic package of 2007”. After
enactment of the fifth NDP in 2012, the MoCLSW started a new reform to evaluate the BP. Although those measures were based on scientific methodology –called “new BP”–, the previous package was enacted in reality.

The Health Transformation Plan (HTP) of 2014 also affected the BP. HTP initiated the revision of the tariff system and the new Relative Value Unit (RVU) book, which the medical tariffs that were based on the California book. In this book, all services offered in the health system of the country, including procedures, surgeries, imaging, laboratories, etc. were listed; those services which did not covered by any insurance organizations, marked with an asterisk (*).

“…By 2013, the book of Relative Value Service (RVU) was published. This book includes all new and old health services.. It was actually was considered as revisation ob BP, the book was intended to revise the tariff but In fact, there was some kind of review BP…” (R 19)

The process of the BP implementation

Since 1993, all decisions about including and/or excluding a service within the BP are made by the HCHI Secretariat, with participation of related stakeholders. When a new service is proposed to be included within the BP, the HCHI Secretariat invites various stakeholders (i.e. permanent members of the HHIC, and representatives of the MoHME, health insurance organization, and the IMA as well as other members from professional associations), to attend in a meeting and discuss the agenda. The process and methods of holding these meetings has not changed significantly ever since, with consensus building among members as the dominant method for making decisions. Bargaining of health insurance organizations is mainly focused on financial burden of services, while professional associations may attempt to exaggerate the importance of proposed services. Except for few cases, no specific criteria and/or method (e.g. cost-effectiveness studies, guidelines and etc.) is used to make such decisions. Often, several meetings (in some cases it may take several years), are held until the HCHI Secretariat makes the decisions to include the service within the BP. Services with high financial burden, would require approval by the cabinet:

“In some cases, health insurance organizations propose a service, all proposes, either from the MoHME or MoCLSW, send to the HCHI for expert analysis. There is a waiting list. representatives from
different organization as well as MoHME and MoCLSW debate. If consensus is on its inclusion, the cabined must confirm the decision” (R 3).

Evaluation of BP-related policies: evaluation refers to the investigation of whether goals of the policies were achieved and whether or not an implementation gap exists. Three main themes were identified: revision of the BP, revising the methods and decisions, and evaluating the aims of BP-related policies. We also identified 13 sub-themes.

BP’s revision

Since 1993, any revision in the BP has been mainly focused on creating a more coherent and evidence-based package. In some cases (e.g. in 2007, 2012 and 2014), revisions were temporary and without a defined methodology. Our findings show that no purposive and fundamental revision was conducted. We identified a series of reactional, vs proactive, changes in the content of BP. Rarely, in less than 10 cases, an emerging need led to include and/or exclude some medicines, medical equipment, and services into/from the BP:

“It’s more than 30-years that we have the BP, but there is not a defined method for including a new and better service. Whether it should replace the older service or not”(R 4).

Excluding Over-The-Counter (OTC) drugs was one of the main recent changes. Since 2012, an expert panel has been established for excluding OTC drugs from the BP and allocating the released funds for medicines related to special diseases.

Revising the methods and decisions

Revising and reforming the processes that are related to the inclusion and/or exclusion services/drugs into/from the BP are not evaluated and revised yet. Usually, it is common to face that due to technological advances or introduction of lower cost interventions, some committed BP are not be covered:

“We never tried to revise the covered services. As well, we never tried to evaluate the BP” (R 12).

Evaluating the aims of BP-related policies

Despite the legislator’s emphasis on the annual revision of necessary commitments by health insurance organizations, this is only available for medicines packages and is not executed on a regular and annual basis. In 2007, Article 3 of the comprehensive welfare and social security system Act helped a big step to be taken towards more transparent decision making about the BP and increasing awareness about insurance services. According to the RVU Book (2015), coverage of
inpatient and Para-clinic services included in the BP was 88 and 89.9%, respectively. Moreover, the National Health Accounts (NHA) (2013), shows that financial burden of uncovered services all services excluded from the BP is only 6% as all services.

Limitations And Solutions

Table 2 summarizes the identified issues and problems of the BP policy process. 11 solutions and 25 policy options were extracted (at least two policy options per each solution). Then, based on the pros and cons of each one as well appropriateness and feasibility criteria, they were prioritized by an expert panel (table 3).

Discussion

We investigated the policy process (agenda-setting, development, implementation, and evaluation) analysis for the BP in Iran. Our findings show that various stakeholders have developed different policies with different contents during various periods, without a defined algorithm, while different forces have influenced the policy-making process. Such mechanism has resulted in idiosyncratic way of policy making and defining the BP in Iran. At the macro level, the amount and source of financing are the main criteria to make decisions.

Studies in other countries show that macro policies criteria such as services and diseases that are qualified to be covered, how to cover different age groups, financing methods, by both insurance organization and the government, are considered in designing the benefit package (11). In France, for example, an independent organization is established to regulate, facilitate, and increase the transparency of the BP and organize providers’ compensation. A new treatment will only be accepted if it is proved that have higher benefits (with the same level of costs) or lower costs (with the same level of benefits) (6, 12). It seems that the debates around developing policies and changing the steward of developing the BP are mostly focused on source of financing, while adequate attention is not paid to how to develop the BP with targeting diseases/individuals.

While decision-making process is based on reliable evidences and through scientific methods in many other countries (13), our findings revealed that the BP is mostly defined based on negotiating with stakeholders in Iran. Thailand uses a four-step mechanism to make decisions that are related to
include a service into the BP. The criteria that they use are as follow: number of patients who suffer from the disease, severity, cost-effectiveness of intervention(s), types of available services, economic impact on households, and ethical and equity issues in evaluating it (14). Norway also uses the same method as France. Some important criteria that Norway uses to evaluate a service are as follow: cost-effectiveness, personal benefits, and severity of the disease (15). Whereas, our findings indicate that the BP revisions were mostly temporal and non-systematic. Systematic annual or at least biannual evaluations are important for substituting less effective services/drugs with more effective ones, which can increase the quality of provided treatments and also lead to spend fewer resources for the health system. The BP’s goals will only be achieved through revised pathways for defining the cost-effective BP, along with other functions of the health insurance. Otherwise, universal health coverage cannot be achieved and out-of-pocket expenditures will remain high.

Policy recommendation

Here, following prioritization and evaluation of political options, we recommend:

A BP should only contain ‘necessary services’, to be financed by the government. Other complementary services can be financed through complementary insurance or users’ direct contribution.
To incorporate evidence-informed decision-making criteria, i.e. HTA and cost-effectiveness analysis into the process of the HCHI Secretariat meetings.
In line with periodic evaluation and to increase organization of services/drugs lists that are covered, a waiting list needs to be developed for those services/drugs that are under review to be included and those that are about to exclude, due to technological changes, policies changes, etc.).
BP-related decisions need to be taken based on the scientific evidences, precise demographic information (separated based on the age groups, special needs of each age group, and defining targeted packaged according to such information) as well as considering a combination of cost-effectiveness, and socio-economic condition of the country (using multi-criteria decision-making to include services) in the frame of using multi-criteria decisions.
To control service provision and procedures that can be provided, a series of interventions and regulations should be introduced to restrict the import of new drugs and technologies to those that are cost-effective.
To increase the health systems capacity to expand service provision based on the health equity and promoting UHC, new guidelines and standards need to be developed for revising the BP. For instance, the coverage should be restricted to those who are eligible. Moreover, specialized BPs for each level of service provision based on the age groups and diseases categories need to be defined.
A BP should only contain ‘necessary services’, to be financed by the government. Other complementary services can be financed through complementary insurance or users’ direct contribution.
To incorporate evidence-informed decision-making criteria, i.e. HTA and cost-effectiveness analysis into the process of the HCHI Secretariat meetings.
In line with periodic evaluation and to increase organization of services/drugs lists that are covered, a
waiting list needs to be developed for those services/drugs that are under review to be included and those that are about to exclude, due to technological changes, policies changes, etc.). To revise and evaluate the current BP, we suggest categorizing services and drugs into three different lists (i.e. must be covered, must not be covered, and can be covered) based on cost-effectiveness, budget impact, safety, and availability of alternative services criteria as well as experts’ and users’ opinions. This can be galvanized by including the findings of HTA studies for the services that can be covered.

*Rigors of study*

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first deep and extensive study for analyzing the BP policies in Iran, whose findings can respond to long-waiting questions of health policy-makers in this regard. The final solutions presented in this study are based on scientific and objective evidence that have been approved by the experts. However, our study had some limitations. We did not find a universal definition of a BP, and encountered discrepancies between scientific literature and the experience of different countries. We also faced some challenges in obtaining some documentation from different organizations, due to which determining the effects of the BP implementation in achieving desired goals might be incomplete.

*Conclusion*

Given the limited resources and ever-increasing public demand for healthcare services, designing an evidence-based BP, which is in line with upstream policies, is crucial to reach and sustain UHC in Iran. This renders systematic implementation process and appropriate ways to manage stakeholders’ power and influence for minimizing the possibility of conflicts during the BP development. Equitable and quality healthcare with no one left behind, is at the heart of UHC, which is in turn the center of sustainable health development. To reach UHC by 2025, as manifested by the MOHME, Iran has no choice than implementing substantial reforms into its pathway in designing evidence-informed health BP, i.e. but not limited to employing efficient financial, economic and political solutions, e.g. HTA. Unless the conventional method of negotiation and bargaining is replaced with robust, transparent and culturally accepted ways of defining the BP, healthcare system of Iran will face unsustainability in provision of resources and public dissatisfaction, which may in turn endanger its pathway along with sustainable health development.
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| Method and trend of decision-making | 18. Final approval and notifying OHP by the supreme leader’s office  
19. The MoHME is the steward of developing the BP based on the OHP  
20. Endorsing the BP by the third NDP for the first time  
21. Lack of a defined methodology to include/exclude services into/from the BP  
22. Drafted policies are different from notified policies, up to 70%  
23. The HCHI Secretariat makes decision about the strategic policies of the BP  
24. Developing policies according to the available resources  
25. A defined contribution approach in developing BP-related policies  
26. Inadequate attention to people’s preference/demand  
27. Using a top-down approach in developing BP-related policies in OHP |
| Policy implementation | Policy implementation timeline | Before 1993 | 28. Article 29 of the constitution, requires the government to cover all necessary services  
29. Lack of a clear service provision in sectors  
30. Lack of defined criteria to cover services by health insurance organizations  
31. Considering services when deciding to provide a service  
32. Developing the UHI Act in 1993 and notifying it in 1994  
33. Establishing the HCHI within the MoHME  
34. HCHI became responsible for the BP  
35. Experts debating in joint meetings  
36. Commitment to provide all services that can be provided  
37. Determining the covered services by the health insurance organizations  
38. Political top-down decisions, without expert debates  
39. Stakeholders or heads of the meeting have greater influence |
|  |  | Between 1993 to 2003 | 40. Transferring the HCHI Secretariat from the MoHME to the MoCLSW  
41. Insurance-related stakeholders’ influence  
42. Services/medicines on the frequency patterns  
43. Including services, the reviewing less expensive services and equipment  
44. Top-down political expert debates  
45. Introducing complementary insurance to cover services that were not covered by the basic insurance |
|  |  | 2004 to 2006 | 46. Developing the first comprehensive package  
47. Using the most frequent services criterion to develop the BP  
48. It takes a long time to decide whether to include a service/medicine or not  
49. HCHI decides based on the consensus criteria |
|  |  | 2007 to 2014 | 50. Using the most frequent services criterion to develop the BP  
51. It takes a long time to decide whether to include a service/medicine or not  
52. HCHI decides based on the consensus criteria |
50. Special packages or separate resources/stewards (e.g., special diseases)

51. In 2010, the MoHME started strategic purchasing

52. New mandatory criteria (i.e., safety studies, effectiveness) to include new medicines to the national formulary

53. In 2012, new RVU Book was developed

54. In 2014, the OHP were notified by the Supreme Leader’s office

55. In 2014, the MoHME was mandated to develop the new BP

56. The MoCLSW was selected as the steward of financing and implementing the BP

57. In 2014, health transformation plan was started

58. The new BP was defined in the form of the RVU Book

59. Services that are not included in the BP were clearly mentioned in the new RVU Book

60. Defining and providing services that were not previously covered in the BP, as part of the HTP process

| Process of BP implementation | 61. Sending a request to the HCHI Secretariat |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
|                              | 62. Expert review of the request             |
|                              | 63. Deciding about the request               |
|                              | 64. If it has low financial burden, notifying its inclusion to the BP |
|                              | 65. If it has high financial burden, the cabinet confirmation is required |

| Evaluation | BP Revision |
|------------|-------------|
| 66. Lack of fundamental and purposive revision(s) |
| 67. Before 2014, there was no significant change occurred in the BP |
| 68. Due to changes in the treatment methods, some services/drugs are automatically excluded |
| 69. Mandating the HCHI Secretariat to annually revise the BP |
| 70. Temporary and non-methodological changes (three times, in 2007, 2012) |
| 71. Unorganized revision of the OTC drugs |
| 72. In 2003, some performance-enhancing drugs were excluded |

| Revising the methods and decisions | 73. Process and criteria for including/excluding services are not revised |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                   | 74. No evaluation has been performed, and laws and regulations are not revised |
|                                   | 75. In 2013, service prioritizing program was begun, without clear outcome |

| Evaluating the aims of BP-related policies | 76. The impact of BP-related policies on achieving universal health insurance coverage |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                            | 77. The impact of BP-related policies on developing basic and complementary care |
|                                            | 78. The impact of BP-related policies on unifying the BP among organizations |

Table 2: Limitations and problems of the BP policy process
Limitations and issues that can be investigated

- Lack of clear criteria to include services into the BP
- Not considering the epidemiological transitions to increase the effectiveness of included services.
- Scientific evidences were not adequately used
- Health Technology Assessment (HTA) studies were not used
- Bargaining power had an important role in HCHI Secretariat decisions
- The extensive BP list regardless of the priorities and costs
- Policies on BP and the strategic purchasing were not implemented
- Cultural, social and economic issues were not considered
- Passive performance of health insurance organizations to include new proposed services within the BP
- Lack of revision and evaluation systems
- OTC drugs are included in the BP
- Unproportioned percentage of the health expenditures are created by a small percentage of patients
- Development and implementation of programs and policies are not permanent
- Inadequate resources

### Table 3: Solutions and policy options derived from the policy process analysis for the BP

| Solutions | Policy options/description | Pros | Cons |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------|------|
| Differentiating between BP(s) from services that can be provided | Defining necessary services benefit package and financing it by government and defining the higher level package that its financing is elective | Creating elective options for patients/people and financial savings for the government | Establishing limitations access to higher level services |
| | Defining “necessary primary services BP” and financing it by the MoHME and also a “BP for secondary and tertiary necessary services” and financing it by insurance organizations | Ensure easy and free access to primary services, more effective management of curative services with stewardship of health insurance organizations | Inadequate attention insurance organizations to the importance of preventive screening services |
| | Developing a BP that can be provided in all levels and financing it by health insurance organizations | Matching the BP with society’s health needs | Probability of increasing number of covered services without considering available resources of health insurance organizations has increased |
| Using scientific evidences to make BP-related decisions | Collecting and reviewing demographic information | Prioritizing services and evidence-based decision-making, indeed the BP should be targeted | Lack of precise information systems to determine the burden and pattern of diseases by age groups |
| | Conducting HTA studies | Developing a cost effective BP based on the comprehensive needs | These studies are cost-demanding and adequate experts conduct them are not available |
| | Considering cultural problems and needs in developing the BP (i.e. religious beliefs and cultural behaviors) | Increasing the acceptability of services for targeted populations, increasing equity in health | Increasing the probability of health expenditure soaring for the health system |
| | Considering intervention’s QALY and DALY (analyzing the epidemiologic profile, and determining interventions based on it) | Prioritizing services that have more influence on life expectancy and quality of life | Ethical and social criteria neglected |
| Estimating the financial burden of diseases | Direct, indirect and intangible costs | Creating a systemic view or considering costs carried out by patients and avoiding catastrophic expenditures | Ignoring the necessity of covering some services based on economic should not be covered |
| Employing multi-criteria decision-making methods to develop the BP | Considering criteria that are related to economic aspects of services (cost effectiveness, budget impact, reducing poverty, quality and quantity of evidences and equity in better access to health-care services | More economic mix of services and avoiding exorbitant costs; transparency of definitions and prioritizing economic criteria | Some decision have unequal economic consequences |
| | Mixing cost and effectiveness | Creating a | Collecting information is
| Activity | Description | Expected Outcomes | Potential Challenges |
|----------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Controlling inclusion of drugs, services, and equipment that their effectiveness is not proved | The MoHME's intervention in licensing new drugs and technologies or developing and implementing laws and regulations to restrict and control them | Increasing the control over services that can be provided, and, therefore, preventing the inclusion of services that are not cost-effective | A prolonged period is required to update health services and equipment. |
| Organizing services/drugs list that are covered or not covered | Developing a waiting list to include/exclude services/drugs (due to technological changes, policy change, new diseases or patterns) | More efficient management of decisions to include/exclude services/drugs and facilitating annual revisions | More health human resources as well as continuous monitoring are required. |
| Creating a decision-making framework based on mathematical models and defined criteria | Weighting predetermined criteria and determining how to mix them by mathematical models | Transparency of method and process of decision-making and determining weights of criteria to make decisions | Possibility of conflict with ethical and political considerations. |
| Expanding the package of services that can be provided | Expanding the BP by providing extra resources | Increasing access to health-care services | Services utilization is cost-effective and is not exorbitant. |
| Expanding the BP along with developing guidelines and standards for services provision | Expanding the BP along with developing specialized packages for each level of the health system | Increasing cost-effectiveness of services, reducing induced demand | Access to services potentially be decreased. |
| Policies should be based on study’s findings and expert’s opinions | Macro decisions be made at higher levels and following that performing expert studies to increase efficacy of implementation | Clear tasks of middle and lower levels, converging tasks at lower levels | Environmental problems issues are not reflected in macro decisions. |
| Proposing policies by expert level and following that developing and notifying policies at macro level | Developing evidence-based policies | Prolonging decision-making process | |
| Determining macro-level decisions orientation and following that developing expert-based policies | Transparency of overall strategies and finally making evidence-based decisions | Possibility of different interpretations that may affect different macro policies | |
| Organizing HCHI Secretariat meeting on including/excluding a service/drug/equipment | Developing specialized forms which contain key criteria such as cost-effectiveness | Increasing efficacy of decisions through systematic process and defined participation of stakeholders | Challenges may arise in exceptional cases. |
| Revision and evaluation of the BP, both services-and- drugs related | Categorizing services/drugs in three different lists (i.e. must be under coverage, can be covered, and must not be covered). Then, conducting cost-effectiveness studies for those services that can be covered | Making the BP cost-effective by spending minimum time and cost | HTA studies are not performed for all services; categorization may be biased. |
| Conducting HTA studies for all services/drugs that can be provided, then revising the BP | The BP will be cost-effective; these studies will be institutionalized in deciding about including services/drugs | HTA studies are highly time-consuming; social or economic criteria may be neglected. |
| Perform the first method for the services in the package and the requirement for the HTA to include the new services / drug into the package | Having a BP with cost-effective services, as much as possible | HTA studies are not performed for all services; categorization may be biased. |
| Conducting second method and mandating HTA studies | Having a BP with highest possible of cost-effective services/drugs; these studies will be institutionalized in | HTA studies are highly time-consuming; social or economic criteria may be neglected. |
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Diagram of conceptual framework