



Public Health  
England



Doncaster  
Metropolitan Borough Council

# Sexual Health: Gaining Consensus for a Regional Approach to Long Acting Reversible Contraception (LARC)

Sharron Ainslie, Sexual Health Facilitator, PHE YH  
Dr Amy Booth, Public Health Improvement Co-ordinator, Doncaster LA



# Background



- Since 2013 Local Authorities (LA's) mandated to commission comprehensive open access Sexual Health Services, including the provision of Long Acting Reversible Contraception (LARC) in Primary Care for contraceptive purposes.
- PHE; Local Health and Care Planning; menu of preventative interventions. (November 2016). Focuses on access to LARC and the delivery of a training programme to healthcare professionals
- LA Commissioners are required to seek assurance from providers that appropriate Clinical Governance arrangements are in place.
- LA Commissioners may commission sexual health services directly from the primary care provider (general practice) or use a prime provider model (*where specialist sexual health provider is commissioned to sub contract with other providers e.g., general practice*).



# Long Acting Reversible Contraception; NICE Guidelines (2015)



- Women requiring contraception should be given information about and offered a choice of all methods, including long-acting reversible contraception (LARC) methods.
- Contraceptive service providers should be aware that:
  - Currently all available LARC methods (intrauterine devices, the intrauterine system, injectable contraceptives and implants) are more cost effective than the combined oral contraceptive pill even at 1 year of use
  - Intrauterine devices, the intrauterine system and implants are more cost effective than the injectable contraceptives
  - Increasing the uptake of LARC methods will reduce the numbers of unintended pregnancies



# NICE Guidelines; continued



- Healthcare professionals advising women about contraceptive choices should be competent to:
  - help women to consider and compare the risks and benefits of all methods relevant to their individual needs;
  - manage common side effects and problems.
- Contraceptive service providers who do not provide LARC within their own practice or service should have an agreed mechanism in place for referring women for LARC.
- Healthcare professionals providing intrauterine or subdermal contraceptives should receive training to develop and maintain the relevant skills to provide these methods.



# LARC Training Programme



- To be able to fit a LARC Practitioners need additional training and must pass competencies:
  - Faculty of Sexual and Reproductive Health (FSRH)
  - Post Graduate Nurse training
  - Specialist clinic sign off on observed practice
  - Local letters of competence
  - “Grandfather rights”
- Considerations;
  - FSRH means additional costs to the practice or practitioner
  - Reduction in funding from Health Education England (HEE) has impacted on the availability of post graduate courses
  - Specialist clinic sign off but unsure of theoretical training
  - “Grandfather rights” means no evidence of training



# Why a regional approach?



- Sexual health commissioners highlighted specific concerns:

## **Clinical Governance**

- Assurance of safe, high quality care for patients accessing LARC in primary care

## **Quality Assurance**

- Practitioners are competent and fit to practice in accordance with NICE and FSRH guidelines

## **Contract Monitoring**

- Safe systems are in place, with evaluation and audits on practitioner competency

## **Cost effectiveness**

- Review LARC uptake and contract costs within each LA and review across YH

## **Workforce development and training**

- Collaboration with Pharma to provide funding for regional training days
- Identified a risk in the low numbers of Specialist Registrars in Sexual and Reproductive Health in region



# What did we do....



- Gained consensus of what level of training requirements were needed to meet the quality criteria, outlined by NICE and FSRH
- Met with HEE to understand current level of training in region
- Met with Lead Clinicians and the Faculty to seek opinions and guidance
- Mapped out individual LA concerns and costs
- Created a portfolio of supporting documents
- Met with Pharma to discuss sponsorship of regional training programme
- Planned a pilot roll-out using Doncaster LARC Working Group



## Collaboration

- At a regional level, offers consistency and quality assurance across Y&H for LARC
- National interest in Speciality Workforce
- Closer working relationships with the Faculty

## Regional Development

- Opportunity to build a portfolio of documents to support both commissioning and provider work-streams
- Support for smaller LA with no clinical SRH leadership
- Regional training day, providing consistent learning outcomes

## LA Pilot

- Provides real time feedback
- Shared learning



# Challenges



## Loss of service

- Understanding potential impact of the proposed changes if existing practitioners do not move away from “Grandfather rights”

## Timescales

- Individual LAs holding pre-existing contracts and arrangements

## Funding

- Cost to General Practice and/or Practitioner to renew qualification to insert LARC
- Cost to Pharma if the demand for training days exceeds the supply

## Partnerships

- Local Medical Committee
- Primary Care
- FSRH
- HEE



## Local context:

- Prime provider model - Integrated Sexual Health Service commissioned to subcontract Primary Care for the provision of LARC
- LA contracts with Primary Care therefore ceased in March 2015 and new contracts with ISHS started April 2015
- Concerns grew and matched those raised by other regional commissioners



# LARC Working Group



- Doncaster set up LARC Working Group to look at what we could do locally to improve provision
- Group includes representatives from LA, ISHS, Young Peoples Health and Wellbeing Service, Primary Care, LMC and PHE; Pharma opt in where appropriate.
- Made sense to act as a pilot site for the Y&H standard approach to LARC in Primary Care
- Positive response to standard approach although concerns over GPs with “Grandfather rights”; looking at how best to approach this, together with funding and time restraints.
- LMC supportive and see benefit to GPs; key facilitator



# Doncaster Pilot next steps.



- LA completing audit to identify how many GPs/practice nurses are not faculty trained and where they are based
- Amending template documents to “highly recommend” instead of “compulsory”, with 2 year leeway and local certificate of competency, not just Faculty LOC.
- PHE attending South Yorkshire Faculty meeting to seek feed back on standard regional approach
- Open and transparent communication will be key
- Sub-regional leads to facilitate rolling training days across South Yorkshire; 3 a year and they must do one every five years



# Workshop discussion; Share learning, barriers and achievements.

1. Is this a familiar scenario to you?
2. Have you undertaken Quality Assurance for a specific training requirement?
3. Do contract monitoring arrangements cover healthcare professionals competencies?
4. Working with General Practice



Public Health  
England



Doncaster  
Metropolitan Borough Council

# Thank you for listening and contributing

[Sharron.ainslie@phe.gov.uk](mailto:Sharron.ainslie@phe.gov.uk)

[Amy.booth@doncaster.gov.uk](mailto:Amy.booth@doncaster.gov.uk)