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Introduction

Martyn Smith, RHSC
Increases in contraceptive use reduce the number of unintended pregnancies, abortions and births thus changing the need for supplies.

- **Contraception**: Hormonal contraceptives reduce bleeding thus lowering the need for menstrual hygiene products.
- **Menstrual Health**: Pregnant and postpartum amenorrheic women don't menstruate thus reducing the number of menstruators and need for menstrual hygiene products.
- **Abortion & PAC**
- **Maternal Health**
People needing and using key reproductive health supplies

Quantities of drugs and supplies used

Cost of drugs and supplies

Current Landscape (2023)

Changes Ahead (2029, 2035)

132 low- and middle-income countries

Results presented by income group:
- Low-income (26 countries)
- Lower-middle-income (53 countries)
- Upper-middle-income (53 countries)
Innovative use of range of data sources

**UN Pop Division Projections**
- FP Indicators
- Population
- Urbanization

**Household Surveys**
- DHS
- MICS
- PMA
- Other

**Research and Models**
- Guttmacher AIU
- Bearak et al. (2020, 2022)
- WHO Guidelines
- van Eijk et al. (2021)
- LiST
- GLOSS (2020)
- Calvert et al. (2012)
- Abalos et al. (2014)

**Price and Sales Volume Data**
- IQVIA
- Maisha Meds
- Online Pharmacies
- NGO & SMO Data
- IPPF MedAB.org
- UNICEF Supply Catalogue

**Indicates new data source**
Key changes for each health area

- Supporting strategic discussions about the future of financing of contraceptive supplies by incorporating three future scenarios,

- A new category of “mixed” menstrual product use, accounting for women who use both reusable and single-use products,

- New data sources to better capture cost of medical abortions -- differentiating misoprostol use from misoprostol combined with mifepristone,

- A more probing maternal health analysis asking what happens if more women multiple micronutrient supplements (MMS), an emerging maternal health product.
More accessible structure

Overview Report
Dynamic report for a selected country or region

Global GNI Comparison Report
Report comparing across the three country income groups

Country/Regional Comparison Data Explorer
Product Deep Dive Data Explorer

Additional tools coming later this year!
Contraception: Overview Report for Low-Income Countries

Background

Where We Are Now
Current Use
Current Cost
Changes Ahead
Scenarios
Future Use
Future Cost
What’s Next?

Low-income
LMI Countries
All Countries

Income Groups
Low-income

World Bank Regions
Sub-Saharan Africa
Middle East & North Africa
Latin America & Caribbean
Europe & Central Asia
South Asia
East Asia & Pacific

UNPD Regions
Eastern Africa
Middle Africa
Southern Africa
Western Africa
Northern Africa
Caribbean

continues to explore opportunities to achieve universal access to quality-assured and affordable contraceptives required to countries. The type of contraceptives used will be determined by the decisions of individual women and couples, as well as the affordability of contraceptive methods. The supply chain entities responsible for delivering supplies, such as governments, individuals, and non-governmental organizations, have an important role in determining which methods are available.

analysis and predecessor Commodity Gap Analyses (CGA) to provide rich findings to inform discussions about the different perspectives on the cost of delivering contraceptive services. The analysis does not hold all the answers but can help highlight challenges and spark discussions.

It includes estimates of the number of users, the methods they use, and related costs for the selected country or region. This analysis provides insights into the factors that influence contraceptive use and the costs associated with providing services. The two are not equivalent since, for example, the cost of a contraceptive can be borne by the public sector, subsidized by donors, or given free commodities. However, at present in most contexts users of contraceptives are paying out-of-pocket.
Income Groups

LEAP includes 132 low- and middle-income countries[2]. For the landscape reports these countries are further segmented into three income groups as defined by the World Bank: low-income countries (26 countries), lower-middle-income countries (53 countries), and upper-middle-income countries (54 countries). Countries are segmented based on their Gross National Income per capita[3]. This segmentation allows for visibility into differential patterns across each income group and can help focus discussions on the different needs of countries at different income levels. For future projections, results are aggregated based on a country’s current income group; we recognize however that countries may shift between income groups in the future.
Currently there are 744 million modern contraceptive users across low- and middle-income countries

- Sterilization is most widely used method
- Nearly 60% obtain their method from the public sector
  - Most public sector users rely on long-acting and permanent methods
  - Most private sector users use short-acting methods
Currently there are 744 million modern contraceptive users across low- and middle-income countries

- Sterilization is most widely used method
- Nearly 60% obtain their method from the public sector
  - Most public sector users rely on long-acting and permanent methods
  - Most private sector users use short-acting methods
• Most contraceptive users (52%) live in upper-middle-income countries; followed by lower-middle-income (42%) and low-income (6%) countries.

• Most users in each country-level income group get their method from the public sector; however the role of that sector diminishes from 70% within low-income countries to just 53% among upper-middle-income countries.
$5.48 billion on contraceptive supplies

The vast majority of costs are from private sector pills and condoms.

LEAP 2024 now using actual consumer price data for private sector condoms; has led to an increase in estimated costs.
Uncovering an additional $329 million supply costs

Estimating the Additional Emergency Contraceptive Pill Market

LEAP makes estimates of the use and cost of contraceptive supplies based on a demographic approach that is anchored to contraceptive prevalence and method mix. There are many reasons why the use of emergency contraceptive pills is not well captured by this approach; for example, women may not report emergency contraception use when responding to survey questions about what they are currently doing to avoid pregnancy, or they may be using emergency contraception in addition to other methods, and so it is not picked up in the method mix[2].

As a starting point, in this box we present new analysis developed for LEAP to estimate the quantities and costs of emergency contraceptive pills across all low- and middle-income countries. Future versions of LEAP will seek to more holistically integrate volume-based estimates for emergency contraceptive pills, and potentially other methods as well, into the main analysis.

Through a partnership with Maisha Meds (utilizing import/export data), data purchased from IQVIA (commercial sales volumes and prices), and data published in the Contraceptive Social Marketing Statistics (sales volumes) we estimated the size and value of the emergency contraceptive pill market, looking at annualized averages from 2021 and 2022 data (see the Reader's Guide for more details). Based on this, we estimate that 149 million packs of emergency contraceptive pills are sold annually across low- and middle-income countries, representing an annual market value of $361 million. Just over half of the estimated emergency contraceptive pill cost comes from countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, followed next by Sub-Saharan Africa (15% of total), South Asia (10%), and Europe and Central Asia (9%). Due to data gaps, we suspect this may still be an underestimation of the full market for emergency contraceptive pills.

The main LEAP analysis captures $31.9 million in emergency contraception supply costs. These costs come from the small share of modern contraceptive users estimated to be using emergency contraception from survey method mix data. Adding the additional emergency contraception costs ($329 million) surfaced from this new analysis would increase the overall current cost estimate for contraceptive supplies in LEAP by 6%. Interestingly, the current LEAP
Now exploring three future scenarios:

- **Scenario 1: Maintain sector mix.** Increase in the total number of modern contraceptive users but maintain the overall shares of users going to the public and private sector.

- **Scenario 2: Increase public sector use.** Same increase in modern contraceptive users but doubles the share of users going to the public sector (lower limit of 25%, upper limit of 95%).

- **Scenario 3: Increase private sector use.** Same increase in modern contraceptive users but doubles the share of users going to the private sector (lower limit of 25%, upper limit of 95%).

Method mix within each sector is maintained but sector changes influence the overall method mix and costs.

Scenarios not intended to be predictive but show potential implications of shifting roles of the public and private sectors.
Without changes to the methods women receive within the public and private sectors, a shifting role of sectors would lead to large changes for some methods.
Shifting roles of the public and private sectors would have a large impact on the total cost and who incurs the costs:

- With an increase in public sector use (Scenario 2), the total cost of contraceptive supplies would see a **substantial decrease** (-57%).
- With an increase in private sector use (Scenario 3), the total cost of contraceptive supplies would see a **substantial increase** (+81%).
  - Without changes in financing mechanisms, this cost increase would primarily come from users paying out-of-pocket for supplies.

![Figure 10: Change in Contraceptive Supply Costs](image)
Overall change in costs driven change in costs of pills and condoms
Share of costs from the public versus private sector vary across scenarios, and country-level income groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Public Cost</th>
<th>Private Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$295 mil</td>
<td>$379 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Middle</td>
<td>$1.56 bn</td>
<td>$2.49 bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle</td>
<td>$4.06 bn</td>
<td>$7.04 bn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11**

*Future Contraceptive Supply Costs by Sector*  
*By Income Group and Future Scenario, 2035*
Current estimates show 1.72 billion menstruators across low- and middle-income countries in 2023

Purpose-made menstrual health products include:

- Single-use products (pads/tampons)
- Reusable products (reusable pads/underwear, menstrual cups)

Across LMICs, an estimated 78% of menstruators use purpose-made products, although some do not have all their product needs fully met (partial single-use)
The number of menstruators and patterns of product use vary by income group

Reflecting population size and fertility rates within each country-level income group, 10% of menstruators live in low-income countries, 50% in lower-middle-income countries, and 41% in upper-middle-income countries.
Purpose-made product use is higher in countries with higher gross national incomes

Based on available survey data, 35% of menstruators in low-income countries use purpose-made products, followed by 72% for lower-middle income, and 95% for upper-middle income.

Partial use of single-use products is greater low- and lower-middle income countries compared to upper-middle income.
The total current annual costs of purpose-made products in low- and middle-income countries is $28.8 billion.

- The costs for purpose-made products is dominated by single-use products, making up ~99% of the total costs.
- Current reusable costs are small due to the small numbers of menstruators using purpose-made reusable products and lower annual unit costs among users.
In generating projections to 2035, we looked at three potential scenarios:

1. **Maintain product use**: No changes in the proportion of purpose-made product use; changes in demographic, contraceptive use, and fertility rates.

2. **Increase single-use**: Increase in use of single-use products by matching the proportion of menstruators exclusively using single-use products in each income group to patterns seen in the next highest income group within the same geographic region by 2035.

3. **Shift to reusables**: Same increases as specified above, but with a shift towards reusable products where 10% of previously single-use menstruators are exclusively using reusables by 2035 and another 20% are using reusables as a complement to single-use products (mixed users).
The proportion of menstruators using purpose-made products in 2035 increases to 93% in scenarios 2 and 3.

With an increase in single-use (Scenario 2), the share of menstruators using single-use products would be 88% in 2035 compared to 65% in Scenario 1.

With a shift to reusables (Scenario 3) 15% of menstruators would be using reusables and 16% using a mix of single-use and reusables by 2035.
The costs of future scenarios reflect the different levels of purpose-made product use and the types of products used.

With an increase in single-use products (Scenario 2), the total cost in 2035 would be nearly $8 billion higher compared to Scenario 1.

With the same increase in purpose-made use but a shift to reusables (Scenario 3) the cost increase is mediated due to the lower annualized cost of reusable products.
Changes in cost vary by income group; Scenario 3 has a greater cost-savings effect on countries with high current levels of single-use products.
This analysis focuses on priority maternal health drugs to reduce maternal mortality

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal Health Drugs</th>
<th>Indications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron and folic acid</td>
<td>Nutritional supplementation during pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Multiple Micronutrient Supplementation; emerging drug for maternal health</em></td>
<td>Nutritional supplementation during pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydralazine (anti hypertensive)</td>
<td>Acute hypertension event management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl dopa (anti hypertensive)</td>
<td>Acute, chronic and gestational hypertension management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium Sulfate</td>
<td>Pre-eclampsia and eclampsia treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misoprostol (uterotonic)</td>
<td>Induction, PPH prevention and treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxytocin (uterotonic)</td>
<td>Induction, augmentation, postpartum hemorrhage (PPH) prevention and treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heat-stable carbetocin (uterotonic); emerging drug for maternal health</em></td>
<td>PPH prevention[^7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tranexamic acid; emerging drug for maternal health</em></td>
<td>PPH treatment[^8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
<td>Infection treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large shares of cases do not receive the drugs that are needed

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supplementation</th>
<th>Antihypertensives</th>
<th>Magnesium sulfate</th>
<th>Uterotonics</th>
<th>Tranexamic acid</th>
<th>Metronidazole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needed: Received</strong></td>
<td>47,600,000</td>
<td>2,610,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td>84,000,000</td>
<td>686,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needed: Not received</strong></td>
<td>79,400,000</td>
<td>9,050,000</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td>93,900,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>4,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>127,000,000</td>
<td>11,700,000</td>
<td>2,830,000</td>
<td>178,000,000</td>
<td>13,700,000</td>
<td>10,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Share needed and not received:**

- Supplementation: 63%
- Antihypertensives: 78%
- Magnesium sulfate: 42%
- Uterotonics: 53%
- Tranexamic acid: 95%
- Metronidazole: 42%

*Note: in this table supplementation captures just one drug (iron and folic acid), the antihypertensive drugs (hydralazine, methyldopa and out-of-scope drugs) are presented summed together, and the uterotonics (misoprostol, oxytocin and heat-stable carbetocin) are presented summed together.*
The total cost of seven priority and two emerging drugs is currently $216 million

- Largest portion of the costs are for longer term use drugs such as iron and folic acid, and hypertension control with methyldopa, followed by infection treatment with metronidazole.
- The total current cost of the three life-saving maternal health commodities (oxytocin, misoprostol and magnesium sulfate) is $24.7 million. This represents just 11% of the total cost of the seven priority and two emerging maternal health drugs.
In generating projections to 2035, we looked at three potential scenarios:

1. **Maintain coverage:** This scenario accounts for changes in the number of pregnancies and births and maintains current levels of intervention coverage. Provides a baseline for comparison.

2. **Increase coverage & moderate shift in drug use:** This scenario accounts for the same changes in the number of pregnancies and births as in Scenario 1 but increases coverage of included interventions, facility births and introduces moderate shifts in drugs used.

3. **Increase coverage & sizable shift in drug use:** This scenario includes the same coverage changes as Scenario 2 but incorporates more sizable shifts in which drugs are used, including the introduction of multiple micronutrient supplementation,
Large differences in change in cases receiving drugs over time and across scenarios.

For antihypertensives, magnesium sulfate, and metronidazole, Scenarios 2 and 3 do not differ because in both scenarios these drugs will see the same increase in need and use.
Costs increase dramatically with coverage increases and drug shifts

- Limited cost increases seen in Scenario 1, driven by increasing numbers of pregnancies and births.
- Substantial cost increase (+65%) associated with the coverage increases and moderate drug shifts seen in Scenario 2.
- The inclusion of more sizeable drug shifts in addition to coverage increases leads to additional cost of $141 million, a 107% increase from 2023.

![Change in Costs of Seven Priority and Three Emerging Maternal Health Drugs](image)
Changes in cost by drug reflect coverage, demographic influences, and drugs in use.
Drug costs by country income group show similar patterns overall; most costs come from lower-middle-income countries due to demographics.

**FIGURE 11**

Change in Cost of Seven Priority and Three Emerging Maternal Health Drugs

*By Future Scenario and Income Group, 2023-2035*

- **Low**:
  - 2023: $50M
  - 2029: $100M
  - 2035: $250M
  - Increase: $51.8 mil (+185%)

- **Lower-Middle**:
  - 2023: $100M
  - 2029: $200M
  - 2035: $400M
  - Increase: $101 mil (+83%)

- **Upper-Middle**:
  - 2023: $78.4 mil
  - 2029: $156.8 mil
  - 2035: $313.6 mil
  - Increase: $78.4 mil (+117%)

1: Maintain coverage
2: Increase coverage with moderate shift in drug use
3: Increase coverage with sizable shift in drug use
Contraception
Menstrual Health
Maternal Health
Abortion & PAC
In 2023 there were 65.8 million abortion & PAC services across low-and middle-income countries

- Including all safety types and methods
- Broadly reflects distribution of women of reproductive age across income groups
- The vast majority (82%) are abortion services; with some variation by income group.
There is variation in the types of methods used across income groups

- Share of ‘costed’ services increases across each income group
- Least safe abortions account for 26% of services in low-income countries but only 4% in upper-middle-income
- Medical methods make up the largest share of services in all income groups
$273 million in supply costs primarily driven by cost of misoprostol

- Medical methods account for 90% or more of total supply costs.
- Vacuum aspiration only includes cost of MVA kit.
- Wide regional variation in price of misoprostol, which accounts for 67% of total costs
In generating projections to 2035, we looked at three potential scenarios:

1. **Maintain safety profile & method mix:** No changes to the distribution of the safety profile of abortion services or mix of surgical and medical methods.

2. **Shift safety profile:** Improves the safety profile of services by matching the proportion of abortion services that are safe/less safe/least safe to the average pattern seen in the next highest income group.

3. **Shift safety profile & method mix:** Includes safety improvements from Scenario 2, as well as a shift to greater use of medical (especially combined use of misoprostol and mifepristone) rather than surgical methods among safe and less safe abortions.
The share of services that are least safe abortions in 2035 decreases in scenarios 2 and 3, particularly for low-income countries.
The total number of abortion & PAC services will remain relatively similar across all low-and-middle-income countries; however, the number of costed services and the methods used would change under scenarios 2 & 3.
Shifts in safety and method mix (Scenario 3) could lead to higher costs, without decreases in the price of mifepristone.
Increased use of medical methods drives higher supply costs in all country income groups; even when number of services decreases

Future improvements in availability and competition could mitigate costs of mifepristone.
Using LEAP in Menstrual Supplies Advocacy

Tanya Mahajan, MHAi
Case Study 1: Strategic Business Plan for ISO standardization

Targeted data on understanding LMIC markets (using LEAP 2021)

• Market potential
  • LEAP 2021 showed 1.67 bn menstruators from LMICs of which 55% are from low and lower-middle-income countries alone
  • LEAP 2024 shows a higher number of menstruators (1.72 bn) and a higher proportion – 59% from low and lower-middle-income countries

• Growth regions
  • Amongst lower-middle and upper-middle-income countries, India and China respectively accounted for 46-48% of purpose made product use
  • Nigeria, Philippines, Pakistan, Vietnam, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico also significant markets
  • For LICs, Ethiopia, the DRC, Uganda, Sudan account for 50% of menstruators using purpose made products in low-income countries.

These quantitatively make the case for not just why standards for menstrual products are needed, but why wider representation from LMICs is needed in standards formulation as these markets are very different in their composition and maturity.
Case Study 2: The case for informed choice in menstrual health

- Use of purpose-made products is highly inequitable, with 95% of menstruators using them in upper-middle-income countries where single-use products are predominantly used.

- In low and lower-middle-income countries, 13% and 18% menstruators practice partial use of single-use products, showing another pathway for increasing access equitably through a basket of choices.

- Studies indicate a preference for multiple-use products when offered with balanced information.
LEAP further supports this by extrapolating cost savings for a scenario where increase in use is combined with use of reusables and mixed-use, instead of only increase in single-use products.

With an overall cost savings of $5.81 billion, this is an important data point to advocate for informed choice as a tool for increasing access.

In settings where public provisioning will play a role – through large scale product programs and for emergency settings, this can be an important advocacy tool for a basket of choice approach.

Cost savings (in $ billion)

- Low income
- Lower-middle income
- Upper-middle income

Case Study 2: The case for informed choice in menstrual health
Case Study 3: The case for linking MH and SRHR in policy and practice

- Overall across LMICs, 744 million modern contraceptive users are largely dependent on public sector and long-acting permanent methods through this channel.
- Users accessing the private sector show a preference for short-acting methods.
- Joint advocacy for informed choice in menstrual products and a wider choice of contraceptive methods.
  - Body literacy incorporated in MH choice has the potential to support an improved understanding of Contraceptive Induced Menstrual Changes (CIMCs), thus supporting uptake of hormonal contraceptives.
  - Linking MH and CIMC counseling is essential towards effectively addressing menstrual concerns like PCOS, endometriosis etc.
- Most potential for lower-middle-income countries (42% of all users) where 61% rely on the public sector and 70% of public sector users are dependent on long-acting and permanent methods.
Question & Answer

Please put your questions & comments in the chat.
Explore the Overview and Global GNI Comparison Reports online for each health area for more detailed results and to interact with the data.

Visit: https://leap.rhsupplies.org
Thank you!

For more information contact: leap@rhsupplies.org