



# Kiruhura: 2018 PLACE Assessment



## Objectives


- Know the local epidemic
- Assess the local response
- Prioritize gaps for follow-up



Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China, (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Priority prevention areas (PPA) are areas identified by district stakeholders where the risk of HIV transmission is likely to be higher. The map shows the location of venues where people go to meet new sexual partners in each PPA. The location of venues was identified by geographic positioning system (GPS) or, if the venue was not visited, based on a description of its location.


## Most common types of venues



The number and type of venues varied by district. The graph shows the number of venues in the district for each of the six types of venues that were the most common there.

# People meet new sexual partners at venues

## Meeting sexual partners at sites: Perceptions of venue informants



A venue informant is a person knowledgeable about the venue, such as a bar manager. At each venue, a venue informant was asked about the types of people who come to the venue to meet sexual partners and about activities related to meeting sexual partners there, such as whether someone helps facilitate these sexual partnerships and whether staff meet sexual partners at the venue. The graph shows the percentage of venues, among the approximately 300 venues that were visited, where the venue informant reported that each activity occurs.

The PLACE team interviewed and tested approximately 600 people in each district. The surveys showed differences between older and younger men and between women who work at the venues and women who come to the venues as patrons. See below. HIV prevalence among these four groups is shown on the next page.

## Younger men at venues (< age 35)

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	24.9
Has children	27.4
Married/living with partner	41.5
Did not complete primary school	33.2
Unemployed	61.8
<b>Sexual Network</b>	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	37.4
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	77.6
New partner in past year	84.7
Believes main partner has other partners	13.8
Ever had anal sex	0.3
<b>Condom Use</b>	
No condom, last vaginal sex	72.7
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	67.6
Reports that condoms are easy to get	72.3
<b>Vulnerabilities</b>	
< 15 at first sex	14.3
Living at venue	10.7
Ever spent night in jail	33.7
Ever raped	5.5
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	5.5
Ever paid cash for sex	56.8
Daily alcohol consumption	31.8
Visits venue 4+ times per week	44.5



## Older men at venues (> age 35)

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	47.0
Has children	26.9
Married/living with partner	84.0
Did not complete primary school	59.1
Unemployed	80.2
<b>Sexual Network</b>	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	31.6
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	59.0
New partner in past year	59.5
Believes main partner has other partners	19.5
Ever had anal sex	0.0
<b>Condom Use</b>	
No condom, last vaginal sex	86.1
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	65.0
Reports that condoms are easy to get	56.8
<b>Vulnerabilities</b>	
< 15 at first sex	16.9
Living at venue	5.8
Ever spent night in jail	38.9
Ever raped	6.2
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	10.6
Ever paid cash for sex	56.0
Daily alcohol consumption	30.8
Visits venue 4+ times per week	58.8

## Women who work at venues

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	24.2
Has children	23.2
Married/living with partner	20.6
Did not complete primary school	38.0
Unemployed	67.4
<b>Sexual Network</b>	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	45.0
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	66.1
New partner in past year	72.0
Believes main partner has other partners	16.3
Ever had anal sex	0.0
<b>Condom Use</b>	
No condom, last vaginal sex	50.7
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	26.7
Reports that condoms are easy to get	87.9
<b>Vulnerabilities</b>	
< 15 at first sex	11.8
Living at venue	77.0
Ever spent night in jail	12.7
Ever raped	14.1
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	65.8
Ever paid cash for sex	5.7
Daily alcohol consumption	29.9
Visits venue 4+ times per week	87.0




## Female patrons at venues

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	27.2
Has children	21.6
Married/living with partner	54.9
Did not complete primary school	41.4
Unemployed	74.8
<b>Sexual Network</b>	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	14.8
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	30.9
New partner in past year	61.9
Believes main partner has other partners	39.5
Ever had anal sex	0.0
<b>Condom Use</b>	
No condom, last vaginal sex	76.1
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	49.2
Reports that condoms are easy to get	52.3
<b>Vulnerabilities</b>	
< 15 at first sex	11.7
Living at venue	12.1
Ever spent night in jail	9.5
Ever raped	9.3
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	22.3
Ever paid cash for sex	8.6
Daily alcohol consumption	8.1
Visits venue 4+ times per week	34.4

# HIV prevalence and condom cascades

### Distributions of HIV infections across PPAs




This graph shows the advantage of a strategy to focus on the PPAs where the number of infections is greatest. The PPAs with the largest number of persons with HIV who could be reached at venues is shown first in the graph, with the remaining PPAs sorted by number of persons infected.

### HIV prevalence, by group



This graph shows the prevalence of HIV among younger versus older men and among women who work at the venue versus those who visit as patrons. The graph illustrates the high risk among women who work at the venue.


### HIV prevalence, by sex and age




This graph shows the prevalence of HIV infection among the approximately 600 men and women tested during visits to the venues at busy times. The estimates are weighted to reflect sampling probabilities. The graph highlights differences in HIV prevalence by age for men and women. Confidence intervals are provided below the graph.

**95% confidence limits adjusted for sampling weights:**  
 Men: 15-18 (0.00-0.00), 19-24 (0.00-5.10), 25-34 (2.02-18.48); 35-80 (0.56-10.88)  
 Women: 15-18 (0.00-6.60), 19-24 (8.62-22.80), 25-34 (2.68-13.18), 35-80 (0.00-11.41)

### Prevention cascade: Condom availability and use among men who paid for sex or who reported two or more partners in the past 4 weeks




### Prevention cascade: Condom availability and use among women who received cash, gifts, or favors for sex in the past 12 months




The condom cascades above demonstrate the gap in the availability of condoms and—among people who say that it is easy to get condoms—the gap in consistent use. The graph showing the condom cascade for men is for those who have ever paid for sex or who have had more than two sexual partners in the past four weeks. The risk of infection and onward transmission is likely to be higher for these men than for other men. The graph showing the condom cascade for women is for those who have received cash, gifts, or favors in return for sex in the past 12 months. These women are also at increased risk of acquiring and transmitting HIV. Men and women who are living with HIV are included in these figures.

# Gaps in prevention services

## Percentage of venues with on-site prevention services in the past 3 months



### Kiruhura District




**Prevention services at venue**


- ▲ Complete
- Some
- None

These maps zoom in on a PPA or part of a PPA to illustrate the differences in availability of prevention at venues. The map on the left shows the PPA with a higher proportion of coverage. The map on the right shows the PPA with a lower proportion of coverage. “Complete” coverage was defined as condoms being available (either for sale or for free), HIV testing on site in the past three months, and education (either posters or peer education or other educational outreach) in the past three months. “Some” coverage indicates that the venue has education, testing, or condoms. Venues without education, testing, or condoms are categorized as “None.”


### Higher coverage: Rurambira Fishing Community



### Lower coverage: Ngali Subcounty



## Percentage never using a condom during the past 3 months



Many people use condoms inconsistently; some people do not use them at all. The graph on the left shows the percentage of each risk group that reported never using a condom in the past three months.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank the United States Agency for International Development and the United States President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief for their support of this work. ▲ We thank the District PLACE Steering Committee for their support and leadership, as follows: Dr. Ivan Kama, DHO, Kiruhura; Ntungire Fred, Secretary for Health; Kiberu Charles, CAO; Aturinda Nkizibwaki, HIV Focal Person; Dr. Anthony Twine, RHITES-SW (Implementing Partner); and Peter Owomugisha, DISO Kiruhura. They guided the implementation of PLACE in the district, identified research assistants who collected data, and supported efforts to test people for HIV and link them to care. ▲ We wish to acknowledge the leadership of the core PLACE team from Makerere University: Professor Freddie Ssengoba, Professor Lynn Atuyambe, Dr. Simon Kasasa, Mr. Steven Ssendagire, Ms. Milly Nattimba, Ms. Susan Babirye, and Mr. Hassard Sempeera.