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Data producers want to generate high quality information and knowledge, that will be used.
What and where is PMA?

Rapid turnaround surveys to monitor progress in selected FP2020 commitment countries, since 2013

45 rounds of FP survey results disseminated
We want our data to be used.
PMA2020 data are available in various formats!

- Briefs
- Snapshot of Indicators
- Data Lab

But, do they always have what advocates need?
“Data use for advocacy needs a dialogue”

Examples of PMA2020 data use for advocacy
Lagos, Nigeria:
Implant consumables expenses charged to clients

33% of women who obtained modern methods from public facilities paid fees (further analysis based on dialogue)
Kitui, Kenya:
Imbalance between commodity and trained health workers for IUD

But, in Kitui County, 43% of public SDPs did not offer IUD (local data and dialogue)

Kitui Experience:
50 health care providers trained in IUD insertion following PMA2020 findings.
Example of Data on Implant Use and Services
Implant use has increased continuously across countries
Implant method availability remains high or improving

Four latest survey rounds
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Ghana
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Stock-out

In-stock but stock-out in the last 3 months

In-stock
Service readiness does not align with method availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Implant in-stock</th>
<th>Implant service readiness*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC, Kinshasa</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% point gap

(*Facilities have methods, supplies, and trained health workers for insertion/removal)
Quality of care among implant users appears to be good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% told about the duration of protection</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% told where to go to have implant removed</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% tried to have implant removed in the past 12 months</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But, some reasons for unsuccessful removal attempt imply barriers
(Source: PMA2020 Implant Use and Removal Memos)
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