



# Underfunded & Underutilized

An Argument for Vasectomy Advocacy to Improve Method Choice





This resource is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of Breakthrough ACTION and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

©2020 Johns Hopkins University. All rights reserved.



# Table of Contents

Introduction: About This Resource.....	4
<b>Where We Are Now: Vasectomy is Underfunded, Unavailable, and Underutilized.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Where We Want to Go: An Opportunity to Increase Access to Vasectomy.....</b>	<b>18</b>
How We Get There.....	20
Additional Resources.....	26
References.....	28



# Introduction

About this Resource



# Introduction

## About this Resource

### Who it's for and How to Use it

This document is a resource for individuals and coalitions seeking to increase advocacy for the inclusion of vasectomy in family planning and reproductive health (FP/RH) investments, programming, and national strategies.

With renewed interest among donors and the global FP/RH community to increase method choice, as well as emerging visions for FP in the decade ahead, now is the right time to advocate for increased attention to vasectomy as an underfunded and underutilized method.

### How this Resource was Developed

In 2020, Breakthrough ACTION, with support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), reviewed publicly available information on vasectomy programs; interviewed donors, implementers, and coordinating bodies; and synthesized information on vasectomy use, programming, and investment to elevate the importance of vasectomy as a key component of contraceptive method choice and gender equality in FP/RH. The analysis included validation with FP/RH and gender equality experts.



# Where We Are Now

Vasectomy is Underfunded, Unavailable, and Underutilized

# The Benefits of Vasectomy for Global Health Programming

Vasectomy...		
Promotes Gender Equality	Enables Method Choice	Improves FP/RH Outcomes
<p>Vasectomy can increase gender equality and empower broader male participation in FP/RH, reducing the burden on women to contracept.</p> <p>Increasing access to vasectomy would allow men to share more responsibility for contraception.</p>	<p>Vasectomy is critical to method choice.</p> <p>In 2/3 of FP2020 countries, less than 20% of the population has access to vasectomy, limiting the possibility for male participation.<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Vasectomy, like all forms of contraception, improves FP/RH outcomes.</p> <p>Increasing access to vasectomy will reduce<sup>2</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unintended pregnancy</li><li>• Maternal morbidity and mortality</li><li>• Unmet need for limiting</li><li>• The number of women who experience undesirable side effects from hormonal contraception</li></ul>

**Beyond its contraceptive benefit, increasing access to vasectomy can improve method choice, gender equality, and FP/RH outcomes.**

# Vasectomy is Highly Cost-Effective

- Vasectomy is the most cost-effective FP method<sup>3</sup>
- A cost-effectiveness analysis of contraceptives in the US found that Vasectomy **saves the healthcare system 9,936 USD per person after two years** compared with no FP use<sup>3</sup>

Base results from a contraceptive cost-effectiveness analysis in the US

Strategy	Cost (US\$)	Marginal cost <sup>a</sup> (US\$)	QALYs	Marginal QALYs <sup>a</sup>	Marginal cost-effectiveness (US\$)	Cost savings vs. no method (US\$)	Pregnancies avoided per woman vs. no method	QALY gains vs. no method
Vasectomy	902		1.923			9936	1.47	0.141
DMPA	1022	120	1.930	0.007	18,064	9815	1.46	0.147
Copper IUD	1072	50	1.921	-0.009	Dominated	9765	1.45	0.138
Levonorgestrel-releasing IUD	1075	52	1.929	-0.001	Dominated	9763	1.46	0.146
Patch	1742	720	1.924	-0.006	Dominated	9096	1.39	0.141
Vaginal ring	1842	819	1.924	-0.006	Dominated	8996	1.40	0.142
Condom	1939	916	1.903	-0.027	Dominated	8899	1.25	0.120
OCs	2011	988	1.921	-0.009	Dominated	8827	1.36	0.138
Monthly injectable	2067	1045	1.929	-0.001	Dominated	8770	1.46	0.146
Periodic abstinence	2190	1167	1.898	-0.032	Dominated	8648	1.19	0.115
Withdrawal	2597	1575	1.892	-0.038	Dominated	8240	1.14	0.109
Diaphragm	4162	3140	1.870	-0.059	Dominated	6675	0.98	0.088
Tubal sterilization	4931	3909	1.922	-0.008	Dominated	5907	1.46	0.139
No method	10,838	9815	1.783	-0.147	Dominated	-		

<sup>a</sup> Compared to next less costly nondominated strategy over 2 years.

Source: Sonnenberg et al. <sup>3</sup>

**Increasing access to voluntary vasectomy services would reduce health systems costs.**



# Reasons Individuals and Couples Choose Vasectomy



## Social/Relationship

Vasectomy promotes **the role of men as caring partners** by allowing men to share responsibility for reproduction.



## Convenience

Vasectomy **does not require an extra step to prevent pregnancy before sex**, like putting on a condom.\*



## Ease

Compared to tubal ligation, vasectomy is a **quick procedure** (<30 minutes) and **can be performed in an outpatient setting without anesthesia**.<sup>4</sup>



## Safety

Vasectomy has a **very low risk** of complications or side effects.<sup>4,5</sup> While tubal ligation is also considered very safe, it requires scalpel incisions, a longer recovery time, and general anesthesia, which carries greater risk.<sup>6,7</sup>



## Cost

Vasectomy is **inexpensive** compared to the cumulative cost of using shorter-term methods to limit births.<sup>4</sup>



## Effectiveness

Vasectomy is **over 99% effective** in preventing pregnancy.<sup>4,5</sup>

\*After a vasectomy, couples should use another method of contraception until a doctor can confirm there is no sperm present in the semen. It is estimated to take three months and 15-20 ejaculations after the procedure before the semen is free of sperm.<sup>3</sup>

**Vasectomy is a safe and effective method that offers benefits for individuals and heterosexual couples who know they do not want to have any or more children.**


# Despite These Benefits, Vasectomy Accounts for 1.2% of LMIC Contraceptive Use

- While demand for tubal ligation varies by country, **there is clear demand for permanent methods** in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs)<sup>9</sup>

*\*China and India account for a large share of tubal ligation use in LMICs<sup>9</sup>*

- Demographic trends show that couples are having fewer children and ending childbearing at younger ages.<sup>10</sup> This increasing desire to limit births at younger ages means **demand for permanent methods is likely to grow.**

## Distribution of Contraceptive Users by Method in LMICs (percent)




*\*China and India account for a large share of tubal ligation use in LMICs<sup>9</sup>*  
Source: Created using data from United Nations Population Division<sup>9</sup>

**Demand for permanent methods is likely to rise as desired family size decreases.**

## Even Where Permanent Methods are Accepted, Vasectomy Prevalence is Low

- Tubal ligation is common in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia, but vasectomy prevalence in those regions is low.<sup>9</sup>
- Vasectomy is more prevalent than tubal ligation in Bhutan, Republic of Korea, the UK, and Australia.<sup>9</sup>
- In sub-Saharan Africa (not shown), the prevalence of vasectomy is less than 0.1%.<sup>9</sup>

Comparison of the prevalence of female and male sterilization in countries where prevalence of sterilization is at least 10%, 2019




**Vasectomy is well positioned to fill some of the existing demand for permanent methods and unmet need for limiting births.**

# In Low-Resource Settings, Vasectomy is Underfunded and Largely Inaccessible

## Vasectomy programs have received little and inconsistent funding

- Between 2005–2015, vasectomy programs were largely funded by USAID through one of five cooperative agreements (FRONTIERS, ACQUIRE, the Capacity Project, PROGRESS, and RESPOND).<sup>11</sup>
- A 2016 review of published papers on vasectomy programs found only a small number of papers tied to other funders.<sup>11</sup> By and large, funding for vasectomy programs has been sparse and inconsistent.<sup>12</sup>
- As of August 2020, Breakthrough ACTION was unable to identify any large-scale, ongoing, domestically-funded FP/RH programs with a focus on vasectomy.

## In 62% of FP2020 countries\*, <20% of the population has access to vasectomy




**We won't see increased uptake unless we invest in generating demand and making vasectomy available.**

# Investment Leads to Results

Evidence shows that over time, vasectomy can account for a large share of contraceptive use<sup>9,12</sup>

- **High-income countries:** Vasectomy accounts for 13.4%–17.4% of contraceptive use in Australia, the Republic of Korea, and the United Kingdom.<sup>9</sup>
- **LMICs:** Vasectomy accounts for 3.9%–18.7% of contraceptive use in Bhutan, Brazil, Iran, and Nepal.<sup>9</sup>

Countries where Vasectomy Accounts for a Large Share of Contraceptive Use



Source: Created using data from United Nations Population Division<sup>9</sup>

**When programs/countries have invested in vasectomy, they've seen increases in vasectomy uptake.**

## Program Strategies have Proven Success

- In India, RESPOND increased intent to use long-acting or permanent methods in the future by engaging men in the workplace.<sup>7,13</sup>
- In the Philippines, group counseling sessions that promoted conversation about no-scalpel vasectomy improved vasectomy knowledge and increased acceptability of permanent methods.<sup>7,14</sup>
- The ACQUIRE project increased the number of vasectomy users in Bangladesh and Ghana<sup>1,5</sup> and offered no-scalpel vasectomy (NSV) trainings that left health facility staff with more knowledge and fewer misconceptions about vasectomy.<sup>15</sup>
- In Rwanda, the Capacity Project increased demand for vasectomy services so much that demand could not be met through a subsequent scale-up program.<sup>7,8</sup>
- PROGRESS successfully trained physicians to perform a new occlusion technique in Rwanda,<sup>7,16</sup> then a cascade training approach was used to train an additional 60 providers and 100 nurses in 42 hospitals, who collectively performed 2,523 vasectomies.<sup>7,16</sup>
- The Maternal and Child Survival Program (MCSP) Healthy Cities project in Uttar Pradesh used four key interventions to increase demand for NSV, performing 70% of NSVs in the state from January-December 2016.<sup>13</sup>

**When programs/countries have invested in vasectomy, they've seen increases in vasectomy uptake.**

# Spotlight

## Dancing Hearts Campaign Increases Demand for Vasectomy in Brazil


The “Dancing Hearts” mass media campaign in Brazil (1989-90) increased monthly mean number of vasectomies performed at three clinics during the campaign by:<sup>17</sup>

- 108% in Fortaleza
- 59% in Salvador
- 82% in São Paulo

Data from a clinic in São Paulo (right) shows a dramatic increase in vasectomies immediately after the campaign, peaking at 689 vasectomies performed compared to an average of 310 per month before the campaign.<sup>17</sup>

[Campaign Video](#)  
[Published Article](#)

Effect of a mass media campaign on the number of vasectomies performed per month at the PRO-PATER clinic in São Paulo (Poisson regression)



Source: Kincaid et al.<sup>17</sup>

The “Dancing Hearts” campaign shows mass media campaigns can increase vasectomy uptake.

# A Solid Evidence Base for Vasectomy Programming

I

## Program Examples

- Vasectomy Campaign in Ghana ([link](#))
- No-Scalpel Vasectomy Video ([link](#))
- No-Scalpel Vasectomy Materials for India ([link](#))
- Vasectomy Pilot Program in Rwanda ([link](#))
- Revitalizing Access to Permanent Methods ([link](#))
- Impact of Mass Media Vasectomy Campaign in Brazil ([link](#))

II

## Program Tools

- How to Create Successful Vasectomy Programs ([link](#))
- No-Scalpel Vasectomy Curriculum ([link](#))
- Quick Guide to Vasectomy Counseling ([link](#))
- Promoting Sexual and Reproductive Health Products and Services for Men ([link](#))
- Permanent Methods Toolkit ([link](#))

III

## Key Literature

- Lessons Learned in Vasectomy Programming ([link](#))
- Review of 10 Years of Vasectomy Programming ([link](#))
- Vasectomy: A Long, Slow Haul to Successful Takeoff ([link](#))
- Men as Contraceptive Users (working paper) ([link](#))

**Program designers and implementers can draw from existing evidence and materials to create effective vasectomy programs.**



# Global Trends in Family Planning and New Momentum for Vasectomy

Vasectomy uptake and investment is still low, but we can make headway.

Key informant interviews\* conducted by Breakthrough ACTION with donors, implementers, and coordinating bodies in June–August of 2020 revealed **renewed interest in vasectomy** within the global FP/RH community.

With emerging visions for FP in the decade ahead, **now is the right time to advocate for increased attention to vasectomy** as an underfunded and underutilized method.

We can capitalize on progress in several areas to increase uptake of vasectomy:<sup>11</sup>

- Increasing positive attitudes towards FP
- Increasing and improving male engagement in FP
- Addressing gender inequality
  - Improving provider gender attitudes
  - Promoting more equitable relationship behaviors
  - Shifting gender norms to be more equitable

\*These interviews were informal not conducted as part of formative research

**We have an opportunity to put vasectomy on the agenda of global actors and country decision-makers during ongoing discussions about FP in the decade ahead.**



# Where We Want to Go

An Opportunity to Increase Access to Vasectomy

# Supporting Vasectomy Programming Will Help Us Achieve Global Health and Development Goals

## Vasectomy programming will:

- **Enable more comprehensive method choice**
- **Reduce the contraceptive burden on females** by addressing the norm that FP is a “woman’s issue” and encouraging men to share responsibility for reproduction
- **Improve FP/RH outcomes.** Increased vasectomy uptake would lead to reduced unmet need for limiting, unintended pregnancy, maternal morbidity and mortality, and number of females experiencing undesirable side effects from other contraceptives.
- **Establish best practices for introducing male methods.** Lessons learned from introducing vasectomy can be applied to the introduction of new male methods in the future.
- **Provide significant cost-savings.** Vasectomy is the most cost-effective method of contraception.<sup>3,5,11</sup>
- **Better serve couples who use shorter-acting or traditional methods for limiting.** In the long term, vasectomy is less expensive and more effective for limiting than shorter-term and traditional methods.<sup>11</sup>

**Increasing access to vasectomy is critical to enabling method choice, reducing gender inequality in family planning, and meeting the FP/RH needs of all people.**



# How We Get There





# Determine Advocacy Goals

## Potential goals and objectives for discussion

- 1 Ensure Costed Implementation Plan (CIP) guidance recommends evidence-based interventions regarding underutilized methods, including vasectomy
- 2 Increase number of FP2020 countries with vasectomy included in CIPs
- 3 Increase donor investment in vasectomy components of CIPs and other funding for services and demand generation



## For Each Advocacy Goal, Advocates Should

- Define SMART objectives
- Identify key decision-makers with influence over the desired outcome(s) and their influencers
- Plan supporting activities and create tailored communication materials
- Gather additional support and resources needed to execute the strategy
- Design a monitoring and evaluation plan

\* See [A Guide to Quick Wins—Build Consensus, Focus Efforts, Achieve Change](#) for more detailed guidance.

# Key Audiences

## An introduction to key audiences

The following slides provide an overview of four organization types and their respective roles, objectives, potential drivers and barriers, and key advocacy opportunities.

### Organization Types

1

Coordinating  
bodies &  
conveners

2

Donors

3

Country  
decision-makers

4

Program  
planners and  
implementers

# An Opportunity for Key Interagency Groups



Interagency groups are uniquely positioned to advocate for vasectomy programming with coordinating bodies, donors, and country-level decision-makers because their members are influential technical experts with strong connections to the global FP/RH community.

Together, we can influence key actors across the field and represent the interests of different stakeholders in the community.

**Interagency groups are uniquely positioned to advocate with key actors who can put vasectomy on the global and country agendas.**



## What's Next?

Develop consensus around advocacy goals



Identify funding to support advocacy efforts



Build task team/coalition of advocates



Create a tailored message framework to support conversations with stakeholders ([link](#))



# Additional Resources



## Additional Advocacy Materials and Resources

- Vasectomy Message Framework: A Tool to Help Advocates Prepare for Conversations with Key Stakeholders ([link](#))
- Promoting Evidence-Based Vasectomy Programming ([link](#))
  - Includes briefs on advocating for vasectomy in Burundi, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya, Malawi, Philippines, Rwanda, and Uganda
- Revitalizing Access to Permanent Methods: Lessons Learned from MCSP Country Programs ([link](#))
- Family Planning Advocacy Toolkit ([link](#))
- A Matter of Fact, A. Matter of Choice: The Case for Investing in Permanent Contraceptive Methods ([link](#))
- A Guide to Quick Wins—Build Consensus, Focus Efforts, Achieve Change ([link](#))



# References



# References

1. Track 20. (2017). *Overview: Opportunities for growth*. [http://www.track20.org/pages/data\\_analysis/in\\_depth/opportunities/availability.php](http://www.track20.org/pages/data_analysis/in_depth/opportunities/availability.php)
2. Cleland, J., Conde-Agudelo, A., Peterson, H., Ross, J., & Tsui, A. (2012). Contraception and health. *The Lancet*, 380(9837), 149-156. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60609-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60609-6)
3. Sonnenberg, F. A., Burkman, R. T., Hagerly, C. G., Speroff, L., & Speroff, T. (2004). Costs and net health effects of contraceptive methods. *Contraception*, 69(6), 447-459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2004.03.008>
4. Mayo Clinic. (2019). *Vasectomy*. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/tests-procedures/vasectomy/about/pac-20384580>
5. Sharlip, I. D., Belker, A. M., Honig, S., Labrecque, M., Marmar, J. L., Ross, L. S., Sandlow, J. I., Sokal, D. C., & American Urological Association (2012). Vasectomy: AUA guideline. *The Journal of Urology*, 188(6 Suppl), 2482-2491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2012.09.080>
6. Marie Stopes Australia. (2018). *Vasectomy vs. Tubal Ligation*. <https://www.vasectomy.org.au/faqs/vasectomy-vs-tubal-ligation/>.
7. Shattuck, D., Perry, B., Packer, C., & Quee, D. C. (2016). A review of 10 years of vasectomy programming and research in low-resource settings. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 4(4), 647-660. <http://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-16-00235>
8. Labrecque, M., Pile, J., Sokal, D., Kaza, R. C., Rahman, M., Bodh, S. S., ... & Vaidya, T. M. (2005). Vasectomy surgical techniques in South and South East Asia. *BMC urology*, 5(1), 10. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2490-5-10>
9. United Nations Population Division. (2019). *Contraceptive use by method 2019: Data booklet*. <https://tinyurl.com/yb3afn5t>
10. Van Lith, L. M., Yahner, M., & Bakamjian, L. (2013). Women's growing desire to limit births in sub-Saharan Africa: meeting the challenge. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 1(1), 97-107. <http://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-12-00036>
11. Perry, B., Packer, C., Chin Quee, D., Zan, T., Dulli, L., & Shattuck, D. (2016). *Recent experience and lessons learned in vasectomy programming in low-resource settings: A document review*. <https://www.fhi360.org/resource/promoting-evidence-based-vasectomy-programming>
12. Shelton, J. D., & Jacobstein, R. (2016). Vasectomy: a long, slow haul to successful takeoff. *Global Health Science and Practice*, 4(4), 514-517. doi:10.9745/GHSP-D-16-00355
13. Yahner, M., & Cisek, C. (2012). *Using an employer-based approach to increase support for and provision of long-acting and permanent methods of contraception: The India experience*. The RESPOND project study series: Contributions to global knowledge: Report no. 7. <http://www.respond-project.org/archive/files/4/4.1/4.1.3/Study7-2012-Using-an-Employer-Based.pdf>
14. David, F. P. (2003). *Group counseling as an approach to family planning promotion and dropout reduction, with focus on no-scalpel vasectomy: An experimental trial and process documentation study*. Iloilo City (Philippines): Social Science Research Institute, Central Philippine University. Cited by: Shattuck, D., Perry, B., Packer, C., & Quee, D. C. (2016). A review of 10 years of vasectomy programming and research in low-resource settings. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 4(4), 647-660. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-16-00235
15. Cisek, C., & Taylor, J. (2008). *Revitalizing underutilized family planning methods. Assessing the impact of an integrated supply-demand vasectomy initiative in Ghana*. Acquiring Knowledge No. 13. Cited by: Shattuck, D., Perry, B., Packer, C., & Quee, D. C. (2016). A review of 10 years of vasectomy programming and research in low-resource settings. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 4(4), 647-660. <http://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-16-00235>
16. Labrecque, M., Kagabo, L., Shattuck, D., Wesson, J., Rushanika, C., Tshibanbe, D., ... & Sokal, D. C. (2013). Strengthening vasectomy services in Rwanda: introduction of thermal cautery with fascial interposition. *Contraception*, 87(3), 375-379. doi: 10.1016/j.contraception.2012.08.019
17. Kincaid, D. L., Merritt, A. P., Nickerson, L., de Castro Buffington, S., De Castro, M. P. P., & De Castro, B. M. (1996). Impact of a mass media vasectomy promotion campaign in Brazil. *International Family Planning Perspectives*, 22(4), 169-175.