

Kyenjojo: 2018 PLACE Assessment

Objectives

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



Fieldwork

Engaged **57** stakeholders



Trained **20** people



Identified **8** priority prevention areas



Identified **563** venues in PPAs



Visited & profiled **265** venues




Interviewed & tested **600** people



Identified **35** people who were HIV-positive




Assessed HIV prevention/treatment for **600** people



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)	25.4
Has children	22.1
Married/living with partner	45.4
Did not complete primary school	29.6
Unemployed	49.4
Sexual Network	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	34.9
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	76.1
New partner in past year	74.4
Believes main partner has other partners	15.2
Ever had anal sex	13.8
Condom Use	
No condom, last vaginal sex	78.0
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	60.8
Reports that condoms are easy to get	76.1
Vulnerabilities	
< 15 at first sex	10.0
Living at venue	9.2
Ever spent night in jail	26.9
Ever raped	6.7
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	18.4
Ever paid cash for sex	46.5
Daily alcohol consumption	28.3
Visits venue 4+ times per week	54.4



Older men at venues (> age 35)

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	48.7
Has children	12.4
Married/living with partner	77.4
Did not complete primary school	68.4
Unemployed	69.3
Sexual Network	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	19.7
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	47.2
New partner in past year	51.8
Believes main partner has other partners	18.6
Ever had anal sex	1.0
Condom Use	
No condom, last vaginal sex	83.4
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	19.0
Reports that condoms are easy to get	66.8
Vulnerabilities	
< 15 at first sex	8.2
Living at venue	13.4
Ever spent night in jail	51.8
Ever raped	5.7
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	1.2
Ever paid cash for sex	25.8
Daily alcohol consumption	43.3
Visits venue 4+ times per week	83.5

Women who work at venues

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	27.5
Has children	31.1
Married/living with partner	57.2
Did not complete primary school	46.3
Unemployed	60.4
Sexual Network	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	19.3
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	38.0
New partner in past year	41.0
Believes main partner has other partners	49.8
Ever had anal sex	5.1
Condom Use	
No condom, last vaginal sex	82.5
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	45.5
Reports that condoms are easy to get	70.6
Vulnerabilities	
< 15 at first sex	1.5
Living at venue	58.9
Ever spent night in jail	9.5
Ever raped	18.4
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	38.3
Ever paid cash for sex	16.7
Daily alcohol consumption	30.1
Visits venue 4+ times per week	86.8




Female patrons at venues

Demographics	%
Mean age (in years)	28.8
Has children	36.5
Married/living with partner	57.4
Did not complete primary school	49.0
Unemployed	71.4
Sexual Network	
2+ sexual partners, past 4 weeks	15.1
With 2 or more sexual partners in the past year	42.7
New partner in past year	53.1
Believes main partner has other partners	57.8
Ever had anal sex	3.9
Condom Use	
No condom, last vaginal sex	84.7
2+ partners past 4 weeks, no condom last sex	35.1
Reports that condoms are easy to get	68.2
Vulnerabilities	
< 15 at first sex	18.6
Living at venue	8.5
Ever spent night in jail	27.7
Ever raped	21.6
Exchanged sex for money in past 3 months	30.6
Ever paid cash for sex	2.9
Daily alcohol consumption	13.1
Visits venue 4+ times per week	35.1

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 (1.61-19.35), 25-34 (0.82-9.73); 35-80 (2.25-11.35)
Women: 15-18 (0.00-0.00), 19-24 (1.20-15.29), 25-34 (0.00-6.97), 35-80 (0.18-10.98)

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




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: Kyenjojo Town Council




Kyenjojo District



Lower coverage: Rwensinga Trading Center



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. Charles Tusiime, DHO; Mr. Agaba Emmanuel, DAC, Chairperson; Mr. Kamara Georgewilliam, Secretary for Health, Kyenjojo; Honorable Kawonawo Isaac, RDC, Kyenjojo; Mugabi Simon Peter, District Biostatistician; and Bwerere G.William, HIV Focal Person. 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 Sseengooba, Professor Lynn Atuyambe, Dr. Simon Kasasa, Mr. Steven Ssendagire, Ms. Milly Nattimba, Ms. Susan Babirye, and Mr. Hassard Sempeera.