

# Joint Health and Wellbeing/ICP Strategy 2022-2030: Setting the level of ambition (Appendix C)


## Introduction

The Health and Wellbeing Strategy overarching goals presented here are based on the system wide discussions held in October 2021 and January 2022. The January 2022 workshop specifically discussed the level of ambition for the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and highlighted that these goals should be stretching and ambitious while remaining plausible and achievable.

This technical appendix presents the best available evidence on the current situation for the three goals and proposes the level of ambition for each. It is important to note that the full impact of the Covid-19 pandemic is not yet showing up in the available data. We may in fact be starting from a lower point than the data below suggests; as such we suggest revisiting these targets once data is available that shows the full impact of the pandemic on our measures.

All the goals set out here are targets for the end of the strategy period in 2030.

All of the four priority areas (children, environment, poverty and mental health) will feed in to all three goals (image below), but some will have closer links than others. The priority areas will also develop their own targets which will include shorter-term metrics; these are yet to be determined but it will need to be clear how those targets feed in to these three overarching goals.



## 1. We will increase the number of years that people spend in good health.

**TARGET: We will increase healthy life expectancy by at least two years in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and we will reduce the gaps between men and women in our areas.**

What does healthy life expectancy mean?

- For a particular area and time period, it is an estimate of the average number of years a newborn baby would live in good general health if he or she experienced the age-specific mortality rates and prevalence of good health for that area and time period throughout his or her life.
- Put simply, it is the number of years in good health that an average person can expect. It was chosen for one of our goals over life expectancy because life expectancy includes the years often spent at the end of life in poor health, and we do not seek to extend these. Healthy life expectancy has been described as 'adding life to years' rather than 'adding years to life.'

Table 1 presents the latest data on healthy life expectancy for our area. At present Cambridgeshire residents have considerably higher healthy life expectancy than in Peterborough, for both men and women. Interestingly, in Peterborough women can expect fewer years in good health than men, while the reverse is true in Cambridgeshire. Therefore, we aim to see an increase of at least two years for women in Cambridgeshire and men in Peterborough, but to narrow the gap between the sexes we also want to see a larger increase for Cambridgeshire men and Peterborough women.

The initial system wide workshops in October 2021 and January 2022 discussed a improvement levels of 10% for each target. For Healthy Life Expectancy this would be an unrealistic increase of at least six years which would take us beyond the current best in England.

*Table 1 Healthy Life Expectancy in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough*

	<b>Cambridge- shire (2017-19)</b>	<b>Cambridge- shire Plus 2 yrs</b>	<b>Peterborough (2017-19)</b>	<b>Peterborough Plus 2 years</b>	<b>Best in England (2017-19)</b>
Male healthy life expectancy	64.3	66.3	62.8	64.8	71.5
Female healthy life expectancy	66.2	68.2	59.9	61.9	71.4

We should also bear in mind that, as with most public health measures, healthy life expectancy is strongly linked to deprivation. Although figures for small areas are not

available to demonstrate the link in our local areas, national data shows clearly that people living in wealthier areas enjoy considerably more time in good health on average compared to residents of more deprived areas. We cannot set local targets to preferentially improve healthy life expectancy in our more deprived areas, but if this strategy includes a focus throughout on health inequalities we would expect healthy life expectancy to improve faster in these areas.

Healthy life expectancy was recently mentioned in the 'Levelling Up' White Paper<sup>1</sup> with one of the 'missions' described as: *"By 2030, the gap in Healthy Life Expectancy (HLE) between local areas where it is highest and lowest will have narrowed, and by 2035 HLE will rise by five years."* This document refers to a forthcoming White Paper on health disparities that will set out the central governmental strategy for 'tackling the core drivers of inequalities in health outcomes. As such, we anticipate national policy support and action to facilitate this local target.

As with preventable premature mortality, increasing healthy life expectancy depends on core public health work and prevention and early intervention work delivered by the NHS. All four priorities will feed into increasing healthy life expectancy.

## **2. We will reduce inequalities in preventable deaths before the age of 75 years.**

**TARGET: We will reduce inequalities in preventable deaths before the age of 75 years by 20%.**

Premature mortality here is defined as any death before 75 from causes considered preventable. It is presented as age-standardised rates per 100,000 rather than as absolute numbers.

Deaths are considered preventable if

- all or most deaths from the underlying cause could mainly be avoided through effective public health and primary prevention interventions.
- 'preventable' deaths include most infectious disease, some cancers, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, injuries and alcohol and drug-related deaths.<sup>2</sup>

Preventable premature mortality rates are lower than the England average in Cambridgeshire but close to the England average in Peterborough (Figure 1). Rates have not changed much over the last ten years in either area, as the chart below shows. Comparing these two charts demonstrates an inequality between Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, which is probably a result of different levels of prosperity between these areas overall.


*Figure 1 Preventable deaths under 75 per 100,000 in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough compared to England*

---

<sup>1</sup> HM Government (2022) Levelling up the United Kingdom


<sup>2</sup> For a full list of ICD-10 codes included in the definition of preventable deaths, see <https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/mortality-profile#page/6/gid/1938133056/pat/15/ati/402/are/E10000003/iid/93721/age/163/sex/4/cat/-1/ctp/-1/yr/1/cid/4/tbm/1/page-options/car-do-0>

## Peterborough




Period	Count	Rate
2010	210	165.6
2020	228	144.8

## Cambridge



Period	Count	Rate
2010	587	118.8
2020	655	110.9

Preventable premature mortality rates also vary substantially by small areas (MSOA), with a clear link to deprivation. The chart below shows under-75 preventable mortality rates by Cambridgeshire MSOA (Peterborough not shown but a similar relationship exists). The blue line is the line of best fit for the current data (a regression line) which shows a strong relationship between increasing deprivation and increasing rates of preventable premature mortality. People in our some of our most deprived Cambridgeshire areas have a preventable mortality rate around four times higher than those in our least deprived areas; a substantial disparity. Please note that this data is the most recent available data and covers a three year period ending in 2019; as such the impact of the pandemic is not shown. At present the definition of premature preventable mortality data does not include deaths from Covid-19 (although it does include influenza deaths).



Reducing inequalities in premature mortality would require reducing the slope of this line to the red line shown above – our target. This is a 20% reduction in the slope of the line. This would have most benefit to those people in our most deprived communities but should also benefit people across the area; for instance, fairly well off areas (an IMD score between 10 and 20) also have some way to go to reduce their rates down to the red line.

The initial workshops discussed reducing targets by 10%. However, after considering what this would look like in practice, this has been considered as insufficiently ambitious and that in fact a 20% reduction was closer to the level of ambition discussed.

Reducing the slope of the line will also have the effect of reducing premature mortality overall. If the rates in the least deprived areas remain similar but the gradient reduces by 20%, we would have an overall preventable premature mortality rate of around 92 per 100,000 in Cambridgeshire, compared to 102 per 100,000 at present.<sup>3</sup> We will also have a target to reduce Peterborough's preventable mortality gradient by 20%

This target illustrates the principle of 'proportionate universalism'. To meet the target and reduce health inequalities, we need to work across our whole population, recognising there is room for improvement everywhere, but directing more efforts to those living in our most deprived areas where mortality is highest.

The work needed to reduce preventable premature mortality needs to take place largely in public health and in primary prevention. Improving health behaviour is key, as is early identification and intervention, including primary care and immunisation and

<sup>3</sup> Exact overall rate cannot be predicted.

screening. However, this target needs to also be seen in the context of the wider determinants of health and behaviour; the standard offers that reduce the risks of disease leading to premature mortality may not be sufficient (or may not be delivered to the same standard) in our most deprived areas. As such, each of the four priority areas has an important role to play in reducing premature mortality.

### **3. We will have better outcomes for our children.**

#### **TARGET: We will be the best of our comparators for core children and young people outcomes**

Children and young people have been adversely affected by the pandemic across many areas of their lives, from loss of education, socialisation and jobs as well as increasing demand for mental health services from children and young people. Giving children the best start to life will pay dividends across the life course. Therefore, rather than a single outcome, the ambition is to improve across core children and young outcomes and be the best of our comparators. This priority is not limited to children's educational attainment; children's physical and mental health and wellbeing will be explicitly included.

Considerable work has already taken place on this topic and system-wide strategies currently already exist (or are in development) focusing on the main aspects of children and young people's lives. These strategies are led by the Children's and Maternity Collaborative who working across health, education and local authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. This has not been further defined at present because of the likely large overlap with the children and young People and mental health priority-specific targets. An important early step for these priorities will be to determine what outcomes should be included as overarching goals for the whole strategy and are likely to include the aspects below

- Best Start in Life (children 0-5 yrs)
- Strong Families Strong Communities (children and young people 5-25 yrs)
- Children and Young People's Mental Health
- Special Educational Needs and Disabilities including autism
- Autism

#### **How are these goals linked?**

These three overarching goals all interact. Improving child health will have significant effects on improving healthy life expectancy, because healthy life expectancy is strongly influenced by deaths in younger age groups. Reducing premature mortality will also affect healthy life expectancy, both by preventing death, but also because most of the conditions that contribute to premature mortality also cause substantial ill health for many people before death. If we are able to improve interventions to prevent these conditions in the first place then as well as preventing deaths, we will also prevent the associated ill health burden that reduces healthy life expectancy.

The focus on inequality means that we have to carefully consider how to do things differently – the 'easier' groups to influence are often those who are better off. Working with these better off groups would see overall rates decrease, but unless rates decrease faster for the more deprived then inequalities will worsen. Improving

outcomes for people at the most deprived end of the spectrum can be much harder, but it is also where there is most room for improvement.

### **The impact of Covid-19 on these metrics**

Much of the full impact of the pandemic does not yet show up in these metrics. The healthy life expectancy data available at present only goes up to 2019, as do our small-area data on preventable premature mortality which allows us to see local inequalities in early deaths.

We know that overall life expectancy has shown a sharp downturn however in 2020, a pattern seen clearly in the charts below for men in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough though less apparent for women in our areas. Healthy life expectancy will have been similarly affected and so we will be starting from a lower base in 2022 than suggested by the figures above. We also know that Covid-19 has disproportionately affected our more deprived areas and communities, as is the case across the UK and beyond. As such, inequalities in healthy life expectancy and in premature mortality are likely to have worsened in the last two years.

We recommend revisiting the targets when data is available to give us a more accurate picture of our starting point at the beginning of 2022.