63% of countries spent government funds on contraceptive procurement.

Government share of total spending for contraceptive procurement (where known)

(Government funds include internally generated funds and/or other funds given to the government.)

On average, countries offer 8 methods in the public sector.

Public sector methods offered and central warehouse stock information

91% of countries surveyed have a committee that works on contraceptive security.

Percent of these countries with a representative from each sector on the contraceptive security committee

88% of countries have a contraceptive security strategy.

Is there a CS strategy?

data was provided by many survey respondents, including USAID missions, ministries of health, USAID | DELIVER PROJECT field offices, and additional in-country partners.

For more information on the Contraceptive Security Indicators, visit http://deliver.jsi.com

This dashboard was produced with support from the U.S. Agency for International Development, through Task Order 4 of the USAID | DELIVER PROJECT, under contract no. GPO-1-00-06-00007-00.
**Introduction and Purpose:**
Through the Contraceptive Security (CS) Indicators, countries can track a comprehensive set of indicators that reflect key aspects of contraceptive security. In-country and global stakeholders can use these indicators to monitor country-level CS status and trends for programmatic and advocacy purposes.

This dashboard presents a quick overview of CS Indicators data for the 43 countries surveyed in 2013. This was the fourth annual round of data collection.

**Data Sources:**
The indicators were designed to routinely capture readily available information through a key informant survey and a review of existing local documents. Country respondents were mainly USAID missions and USAID | DELIVER PROJECT staff, often with input from the Ministry of Health and other partners. The data are contingent upon the knowledge of the respondents and the accuracy of the additional data sources consulted.

**Additional Findings:**
Key findings in addition to those highlighted on the front of this handout include--

- **21% charge for family planning services**
  - 60% have exemptions for those who cannot afford to pay

- **58% had insufficient funding for contraceptive procurement**

- **70% had a central-level stockout at some point during the last year.**

**Indicator Topics:**

- **Finance & Procurement (Capital)**
  - dollar value of estimated need for contraceptives to be procured for the public sector (value of quantification)
  - existence of a government budget line item for contraceptives
  - amount government allocated for contraceptives
  - amount government spent for contraceptives
  - value of in-kind contraceptive donations and Global Fund grants used for contraceptives for the public sector
  - information on whether there was a funding gap
  - information about the government’s procurement mechanism.

- **Commodities**
  - range of contraceptive methods offered in public facilities, private facilities, NGO facilities, and through social marketing.

- **Policies (Commitment)**
  - existence of a national contraceptive security strategy
  - inclusion of contraceptives on the National Essential Medicine List
  - inclusion of contraceptive security and family planning information in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
  - existence of additional policies limiting or promoting access to family planning.

- **Coordination and Leadership**
  - existence of a national committee that works on contraceptive security and types of organizations represented
  - frequency of committee meetings
  - legal status of the committee
  - existence of a contraceptive security “champion”.

- **Supply Chain (Capacity)**
  - stockout information at the central level
  - whether stockouts are a serious problem at the service delivery point and central levels, respectively.

Go to deliver.jsi.com for complete databases from all years, as well as briefs, maps, and other resources.
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