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**Abstracts**

**EFPC Mental Health Working Group**

Covid-19 times causes a economic crisis, increases the numbers of unemployment and the feeling having less control over our lives. This situation is the breeding ground for developing mental health problems and makes the position of mental health patients weaker. Because, social and economic circumstances, including living in poverty, low-quality work, unemployment, and poor housing are strongly associated with poor mental health.

We are firmly concerned about increasing inequality for people with mental problems: their mental health status, access to and quality of care and discrimination. What can we do in primary care to limit this inequality? What can we do on a policy level but most of all on a professional/personal level? How can you and I stimulate the butterfly effect where we make small changes with large effects?

In this workshop we will give a short overview of this problem and share experiences and good practices. Anyone who wants to contribute to the reduction of inequalities in mental healthcare, please join this workshop!

**Purpose**

To exchange experiences and reflect about the consequences of the Covid19 crisis on the organization of primary health care: how to return to a ‘different normal’.

**Context**

As most Western European countries, Belgium was severely hit by Covid19. Nowadays over 9500 people (total population: 11.5 million) died. In the Flemish part of Belgium, there are 35 Community Health Centres (CHC), financed via the capitation system, but the major part of health care providers is working in the fee-for-service system.

**State of the art**

Some remarkable observations from Community Health Centres:

- Rapid shift from traditional face-to-face consultations to telephone consultations, not hindered by financial consequences, thanks to a capitation system. In fee-for-service practices, there was a problem, as there was need to create a new type of “service”: the telephone consultation;
- Patients with symptoms suspect for Covid19, were cared for in separate tracks, both in the practice and in the community (in the so called ‘Triage’-centres with family physicians);
- Telephone calls to vulnerable patients in order to guarantee continuity of care;
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- Telephone calls to vulnerable patients in order to guarantee continuity of care;
• Interprofessional team-work with task-shifting and competency-sharing;
• Major problems: lack of Personal Protection Equipment, and no tests available in the community at the onset of the pandemic, hence need to refer to hospital for testing;
• In the second phase: increasing morbidity and mortality in elderly nursing home patients, hence need to support the teams in the homes;
• Participation of the staff in ‘cohorted care’ for Covid+ patients at home;
• Serious psycho-social impact of the pandemic and the lockdown on the population, hence a challenge for social work and primary care psychologists.

Main lessons from the experience:
• Community Health Centres are well prepared and well organized to cope with the new challenges;
• Long lasting debates in the staff e.g. on telephone consultations, were resolved within 24 hours;
• Opportunity for a mind-shift towards population-oriented health care approaches and cooperation with public health services;
• The pandemic was a test for the resilience of CHCs.

Statements for debate
• How to optimize the mix in strategies for provider-patient encounters in the CHC? This includes use of technology and of task-shifting.
• Further investment in sustainability of “integrated needs-based capitation” as the payment system for CHCs.
• Need to strengthen CHCs in the context of Primary Care Networks and Primary Care Zones.
• Strengthen the population-orientation, using Community-Oriented Primary Care approaches, with participation of civil society.
• Special attention for vulnerable groups: patients with chronic conditions, refugees, disabled people, homeless, ethnic minorities,...who suffered most from Covid19 and the societal measures taken (lockdown, physical distancing,...)

Discussion points
• what challenges are there for universities when offering support to socially vulnerable students?
• are there barriers faced by socially vulnerable students in seeking help from university services?
• Where do we stand in terms of monitoring mental health problems in universities?
• what do we need to achieve effective management of students’ mental health problems in universities?
• How can we improve evidence-based practice and policy making in universities?