City Profiles

Recommendations on HIV prevention gaps and opportunities for Health Promotion among Men who have Sex with Men

This document is based on data from the Sialon II project, funded under the European Commission’s (EC) Public Health Programme 2008-2013 (Work Plan 2010). The sole responsibility lies with the authors of this report and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.
NOTE TO THE READER

The document “City Profiles – Recommendations on HIV prevention gaps and opportunities for Health Promotion among Men who have Sex with Men” has been produced as a supplement to the survey report “Sialon II – Report on bio-behavioural survey” which can be downloaded from the following website www.sialon.eu. Therefore, the present document should be read only in conjunction with the survey report, where information on the survey methodology and limitations of the results are clearly described.
1. Introduction

The HIV epidemic continues to represent a pressing public health issue in Europe and elsewhere [1]. Data and documents from the European Centre for Disease Control (ECDC) report that for the WHO European Region, 136,235 new HIV diagnoses were reported in 2013, with a rate of 15.7 per 100,000.

The highest proportion of all HIV diagnoses was reported in men who have sex with men (MSM), with a percentage of 42% [2]. MSM are a particularly vulnerable group due to a mix of social and personal factors, and as a result they are disproportionately affected by HIV and STIs. These high levels of new HIV diagnoses and prevalence are very likely related to an increase in HIV testing behaviours and to the high level of transmission linked to risky sexual behaviour [3, 4]. In line with the 2009-2013 EU Commission Communication on combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries [5], which defines MSM as a priority group and the Eastern EU as priority regions, and in line with the most recent scientific evidence, prevention actions and combination prevention represent the corner stone for tackling the HIV/STI epidemic, especially among MSM.

It was against this backdrop that the EU co-funded the Sialon II project, the objective of which to carry out HIV/STI surveillance among MSM complemented by targeted and meaningful prevention. In the context of this project, a large-scale bio-behavioural survey was conducted across 13 cities in Europe. This “City Profiles” document is based on the findings of said survey and includes a summary of the main relevant findings per city with a list of prevention recommendations based on the local epidemiological situation. Such recommendations – specific for each study site – were developed and cross-checked in collaboration with the local Public Health Institutions and gay NGOs who were involved in the project. The “City Profiles” document should be read in conjunction with the survey report “Sialon II - Report on bio-behavioural survey” which can be downloaded from the following website www.sialon.eu. At the end of the present document, the reader can find also a contribution from “UNAIDS Scenario for the future of Aids” with some reflections on the Sialon II survey findings alongside some broader considerations on the current and future challenges in HIV prevention at the global level.

2 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control/WHO Regional Office for Europe. HIV/AIDS surveillance in Europe 2013.
2. Preventing HIV-STIs among MSM

In the past years, behavioural and psychosocial prevention interventions (e.g. counselling) represented the core activities of the HIV response worldwide and in Europe. Decreasing the number of risky behaviours (e.g.: unprotected anal intercourse) and increasing preventive behaviours (regular testing, condom use, etc.) among MSM still remain the basic and most effective actions to decrease HIV transmission in this specific group; however, new tools and strategies (bio-medical prevention) are becoming increasingly available for reducing the incidence of the HIV infection.

In the international and European literature, few systematic reviews have been conducted to clearly understand what constitutes the most effective HIV/STI prevention actions. UNAIDS, WHO and ECDC have carried out a number of reviews to assess the effectiveness of HIV/STI prevention strategies (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11) for MSM. These include the first systematic review to assess and summarise the effectiveness of HIV/STI prevention interventions for MSM at European level, that is, the “Effectiveness of behavioural and psychosocial HIV/STI prevention interventions for MSM in Europe” report (12).

At this stage, the evidence is mixed, which makes it difficult to draw clear conclusions about specific gaps and approaches in HIV/STI prevention for MSM. However, it is clear that adopting a socio-ecological approach in health promotion and prevention together with the biomedical approach represents a key strategy in responding to the HIV epidemic (13, 14). Combination prevention programmes, as explained in more detail also in the Sialon II Prevention report (available for download at www.sialon.eu) consider factors relevant to each setting, like contextual factors such as policies to strengthen social justice and human rights, levels of infrastructure and services, the local culture and habits, and of course the most at risk populations or sub-populations.

This combination of different approaches targeting different levels can have an impact on the individual behaviour. In fact, the combination of different prevention approaches, such as biomedical, structural and behavioural, seem to be more effective in terms of sustained impact.
on reducing new infections and is highly recommended by various International organisations (15). Such a strategy may include three main types of interventions:

1. **Bio-medical prevention**: this approach aims at decreasing the risk of HIV transmission by reducing the risk associated with the exposure to the HIV virus of other STIs agents. Interventions that are part of the bio-medical approach could be the treatment of STIs, the use of antiretroviral treatment (ART) among HIV infected individuals to decrease the risk of HIV transmission (effective treatment and resulting low level of viral load – treatment as prevention or TasP), the short term use of antiretroviral treatments by HIV-negative individuals after accidental exposure to HIV (post-exposure prophylaxis – PEP) and the regular use of antiretroviral treatment by HIV negative individuals to reduce the transmission probability during sexual intercourse with potentially infected partners (pre-exposure prophylaxis – PrEP). Such treatment strategies should always be accompanied by adequate counselling and psychosocial support on the individual level as needed.

2. **Structural prevention**: Structural interventions try to address underlying factors that make individuals or groups vulnerable to HIV infection. Usually social, economic and political factors are considered as targets for interventions. Due to the nature of these factors, structural interventions are usually more difficult to be implemented as they attempt to deal with deep-rooted societal issues that can only be tackled by the cooperation of governments and local health authorities through legislative or policy changes. Condom provision and lubricants availability, rapid tests and low threshold VCT services could be also intended as structural interventions for tackling the HIV-STIs epidemic as they are usually part of broader policy measures.

3. **Campaigns**: Campaigns are implemented in order to raise awareness on HIV-STIs and to reduce barriers to testing and condom use at the individual level, including among people who do not perceive themselves to be at risk. Targeted prevention campaigns should be carefully designed and evidence-based, that is developed and implemented based on data available (e.g.: campaigns targeting young MSM, or bisexual MSM). They should use a participatory approach that is they need to be developed, implemented and evaluated in close collaboration with key stakeholders, particularly local LGBT NGOs.

In conclusion, the main issues in preventing HIV-STIs among MSM are mainly focused on three pillars:

- Promotion of an increased uptake of HIV testing (16)
- Promotion of a correct and consistent use of condoms with condom-compatible lubricants
- Provision of information on different prevention strategies (biomedical interventions, treatment as prevention, harm reduction strategies, information on drug use, information on sexual health including a rights-based approach to sexuality)

---

15 UNAIDS. Combination HIV Prevention: Tailoring and Coordinating Biomedical, Behavioural and Structural Strategies to Reduce New HIV Infections. UNAIDS, Geneva, 2010
16 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Men who have sex with men (MSM). Monitoring implementation of the Dublin Declaration on Partnership to Fight HIV/AIDS in Europe and Central Asia: 2012 progress report. EVIDENCE BRIEF. Stockholm: ECDC; 2013,
Regarding the last point, in line with the most recent WHO recommendations (17, 18) this means also to provide information on and access to:

- **The Treatment as prevention (TasP)** of HIV infected individuals to decrease the risk of HIV transmission to HIV negative individuals and to provide an effective treatment to reduce the viral load at community level.
- **The Post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP)** which should be available to all eligible people from key populations
- **The Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)** which is recommended as an additional HIV prevention choice within a comprehensive HIV prevention package (new recommendation). For this last option, it should be underlined that a limited number of EU countries could potentially implement such recommendation, taking into account economic and structural barriers.

These main proposals are based on the core publications from ECDC, WHO, UNAIDS, and are part of the current international recommendations on how to respond to the HIV epidemic. In the following section, some specific recommendations are provided, based on the Sialon II survey results.

---


3. Main recommendations based on the Sialon II findings

Sialon II produced important findings that can inform European and local HIV/STI prevention strategies for MSM at city level. For a detailed description of the main project results, please refer to Sialon II – Report on bio-behavioural survey, and for the specific recommendations on prevention, please refer to the Sialon II Prevention Report, which was compiled with the input of community-based LGBT organisations.

In summary, the main issues reported were: a low level of HIV testing uptake (and quite a high number of participants who "never tested"), in particular in the Eastern European survey cities; a high number of HIV positive participants who were not aware of their real HIV-status, with the proportion of new diagnosis ranging from 12% (Brussels) to 88% (Sofia). Especially in eastern European cities, a low level of condom use as well as a high level of perceived stigma was reported. In terms of HIV positive MSM on HIV-treatment, critical situations were reported in the Central and Eastern European cities (Sofia, Bucharest, Vilnius), but also in Lisbon, whilst much higher coverage was attained in Western European cities (Brussels, Hamburg, Brighton, Verona).

From a policy and prevention perspective, the Sialon II project highlighted the different prevention needs among MSM living in the participating cities. For instance, the quite high numbers of people unaware of their HIV status in specific cities highlights the need for further epidemiological studies to better monitor the HIV epidemic. This finding also underlines the urgent need for more effective prevention measures (improving access to testing and prompt referral to treatment, tackling stigma especially targeting high risk groups, such as young or bisexual MSM).

The use of Global AIDS Response Progress Reporting (GARPR) indicators\(^\text{19}\) on prevention programmes also provided comprehensive evidence on the need for more effective interventions, especially among young MSM. The available data on perceived homophobia suggests the need for working with gay-friendly approaches across different cultural, political and social levels.

\(^{19}\) GARPR indicators are core indicators developed by UNAIDS, WHO, UNICEF for monitoring the 2011 United Nations Political declaration on HIV and AIDS
4. City profiles

The following tables summarise the main estimates and data gathered through the Sialon II survey that can be used at local level for assessing the impact of the HIV epidemic and related behavioural – social aspects among MSM.

The GARPR indicators are reported for each city and – in addition – data on unprotected anal intercourse (UAI) behaviours and level of new/recent HIV infections are presented.

Additionally, information on out-ness and perceived homo-negativity levels among MSM as well as an overview of the prevention needs are included, in order to present a clearer and broader picture of the social situation at the local level.
City Profile
WARSAW (Poland)

Testing and treatment

**HIV test in the last year**
(GARPR 1.13 – Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results)

- Among <25: 38.2%
- Among 25+: 59.0%
- Overall: 52.7%

**Treatment**
(proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment)

- Overall: 100.0%

**Condom use**
(GARPR 1.12 – Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex with a male partner)

- Among <25: 51.4%
- Among 25+: 57.0%
- Overall: 55.4%

**HIV prevention programmes**
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reached with HIV prevention programmes)

- Among <25: 25.5%
- Among 25+: 30.2%
- Overall: 28.8%

**Prevention**

**Perceived homo-negativity**
(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)

- At work/school: 17.0%
- By parents: 23.8%
- By friends: 3.8%

- Overall: 38.1%

**“Outness”**
(Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)

**Sexual satisfaction**
(WHO indicator on sexual health)

- Satisfied: 71.1%
- Unsatisfied: 28.9%

**Recommendations**

**What**

- Bio-medical prevention
- Structural prevention
- Campaigns

**How**

- Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available
- Improve condom distribution
- Improve testing offering (community based testing)
- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
- Promote information and testing uptake among MSM

**Limitations**:
estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution.
For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey

Data are based on 2013 TLS survey, on weighted estimates with 95% CI
### Testing and treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV test in the last year</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>61.7%</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>63.9%</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>63.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condom use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIV – STIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV prevention programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived homo-negativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work/school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Outness”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

**What**

- **Bio-medical prevention**
  - Comprehensive HIV/STI prevention including biomedical, structural and behavioral strategies should be considered

- **Structural prevention**
  - To maintain HIV and STI testing with counseling services addressed for MSM
  - Stigma and homophobia towards gays and bisexuals should be continually addressed at a social level consistent with recent legal framework

- **Campaigns**
  - To improve access to tailored HIV prevention programs among young MSM
  - To promote their participation in the programs development
  - Further research on behaviors and unmet needs among young MSM should be undertaken

**How**

- **Bio-medical prevention**
  - Comprehensive HIV/STI prevention including biomedical, structural and behavioral strategies should be considered

- **Structural prevention**
  - To maintain HIV and STI testing with counseling services addressed for MSM
  - Stigma and homophobia towards gays and bisexuals should be continually addressed at a social level consistent with recent legal framework

- **Campaigns**
  - To improve access to tailored HIV prevention programs among young MSM
  - To promote their participation in the programs development
  - Further research on behaviors and unmet needs among young MSM should be undertaken

**Limitations:** estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.
## City Profile
### BRATISLAVA (Slovakia)

### Testing and treatment

**HIV test in the last year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIV – STIs

**HIV prevalence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Syphilis prevalence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hepatitis B infection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hepatitis B vaccination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hepatitis C prevalence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Behaviour

**Condom use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevention

**HIV prevention programmes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social context

**Perceived homo-negativity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At work/school</th>
<th>By parents</th>
<th>By friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Outness”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

**What**

- **Bio-medical prevention**
- **Structural prevention**
- **Campaigns**

**How**

- Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available
- Improve condom distribution
- Improve testing offering (including community based testing)
- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
- Implement campaigns on Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)
- Allocate budget in the National AIDS programme
- Invite members of NGOs working in HIV prevention among MSM into the National AIDS committee

### Limitations:

- Estimates are based on data from the Sialon II RDS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution.
- Data are based on 2013-14 RDS survey, on weighted estimates with 95% CI.
City Profile
BRIGHTON (UK)

Testing and treatment

HIV test in the last year
(GARPR 1.13 – Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results)
- Among <25: 34.9%
- Among 25+: 49.1%
- Overall: 46.3%

Treatment
(proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment)
- Overall: 91.4%

Behaviour

Condom use
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex with a male partner)
- Among <25: 56.8%
- Among 25+: 51.7%
- Overall: 52.4%

Prevention

HIV prevention programmes
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reached with HIV prevention programmes)
- Among <25: 63.9%
- Among 25+: 54.5%
- Overall: 56.3%

Social context

Perceived homo-negativity
(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)
- At work/school: 18.3%
- By parents: 17.9%
- By friends: 1.7%
- Overall: 16.2%

“Outness”
(Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)
- Satisfied: 77.7%
- Unsatisfied: 22.3%

HIV – STIs

HIV prevalence
(GARPR 1.14 – HIV prevalence)
- Among <25: 2.9%
- Among 25+: 20.7%
- Overall: 17.6%

Recommendations

What

Bio-medical prevention
- Continue to facilitate the availability of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), treatment as prevention (TasP), and in due course, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)

Structural prevention
- Continue, and if possible, increase community-based testing opportunities for MSM
- Continue with existing comprehensive condom and lubricant distribution targeting MSM and other key populations

Campaigns
- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Continue with campaigns targeting STIs other than HIV (e.g. syphilis and HBV-HCV)

How

Bio-medical prevention
- Continue to facilitate the availability of post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP), treatment as prevention (TasP), and in due course, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP)

Structural prevention
- Continue, and if possible, increase community-based testing opportunities for MSM
- Continue with existing comprehensive condom and lubricant distribution targeting MSM and other key populations

Campaigns
- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Continue with campaigns targeting STIs other than HIV (e.g. syphilis and HBV-HCV)

Limitations: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution.
For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.

Data are based on 2013 TLS survey, on unweighted estimates with 95% CI.
City Profile
BRUSSELS (Belgium)

**Testing and treatment**

- **HIV test in the last year**
  - Among <25: 42.3%
  - Among 25+: 69.9%
  - Overall: 65.5%

- **Treatment**
  - Overall: 99.6%

**Behaviour**

- **Condom use**
  - Among <25: 83.7%
  - Among 25+: 57.6%
  - Overall: 60.7%

**HIV – STIs**

- **HIV prevalence**
  - Among <25: 0.5%
  - Among 25+: 14.4%
  - Overall: 12.3%

**Prevention**

- **HIV prevention programmes**
  - Among <25: 49.1%
  - Among 25+: 64.4%
  - Overall: 62.1%

**Social context**

- **Perceived homo-negativity**
  - At work/school: 15.8%
  - By parents: 20.4%
  - By friends: 1.7%
  - Overall: 22.8%

- **“Outness”**
  - (Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)
  - Overall: 22.8%

- **Sexual satisfaction**
  - Satisfied: 82.9%
  - Unsatisfied: 17.1%

**Recommendations**

**What**

- Bio-medical prevention
  - Expand Treatment as Prevention (TasP); make Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

- Structural prevention
  - Improve condom distribution
  - Sustain and expand HIV test offers (community based testing) including appropriate counselling if needed
  - Create a legal framework allowing for implementation of demedicalised community-based HIV testing

- Campaigns
  - Implement prevention and testing campaigns targeting young MSM
  - Maintain campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)

**How**

- Implement prevention and testing campaigns targeting young MSM
- Maintain campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)

**Limitations**: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.
City Profile
BUCHAREST (Romania)

Testing and treatment

HIV test in the last year
(GARPR 1.13 – Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment
(proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIV – STIs

HIV prevalence
(GARPR 1.14 – HIV prevalence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syphilis prevalence
(positivity for both TPHA or TPPA or CMIA and RPR; probable active Syphilis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hepatitis B infection
(positivity for HBsAb and HBsAg; positive, negativity for HBsAb; acute or chronic infection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hepatitis B vaccination
(positivity for HBsAb, negativity for both HBsAg and HBcAb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hepatitis C prevalence
(positivity for anti-HCV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condom use
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex with a male partner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIV prevention programmes
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reached with HIV prevention programmes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social context

Perceived homo-negativity
(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work/school</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By parents</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By friends</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Outness”
(Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual satisfaction
(WHO indicator on sexual health)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

What
Bio-medical prevention
- Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

Structural prevention
- Improve condom distribution
- Improve testing offering (community based testing)

Campaigns
- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
- Promote information and testing uptake among migrant Sex Workers – MSM

How

Limitations: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II RDS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey

Data are based on 2013-14 RDS survey, on weighted estimates with 95% CI
## City Profile
### HAMBURG (Germany)

### Testing and treatment

#### HIV test in the last year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Behaviour

#### Condom use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevention

#### HIV prevention programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social context

#### Perceived homo-negativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At work/school</th>
<th>By parents</th>
<th>By friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### “Outness”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sexual satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(WHO indicator on sexual health)</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

#### What

- Bio-medical prevention
  - Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

- Structural prevention
  - Improve condom distribution
  - Improve testing offering (community based testing)

- Campaigns
  - Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
  - Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV/HCV)
  - Promote information and testing uptake among MSM

#### How

- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
- Promote information and testing uptake among MSM

### Limitations:

Estimates are based on data from the Sialon II RDS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.
### City Profile
#### LISBON (Portugal)

#### Testing and treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV test in the last year</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GARPR 1.13 – Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results)</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Treatment (proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment) | Overall | 45.8% |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|

#### Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condom use (GARPR 1.12 – Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex with a male partner)</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HIV – STIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV prevalence (GARPR 1.14 – HIV prevalence)</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV prevention programmes (GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reached with HIV prevention programmes)</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived homo-negativity (Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)</th>
<th>At work/school</th>
<th>By parents</th>
<th>By friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “Outness” (Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few) | Overall | 25.5% |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual satisfaction (WHO indicator on sexual health)</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendations

**What**

- **Bio-medical prevention**
  - Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

- **Structural prevention**
  - Improve condom distribution
  - Improve testing offering (community based testing)
  - Implement sexual education in schools

- **Campaigns**
  - Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
  - Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
  - Promote information and testing uptake among migrant Sex Workers – MSM
  - Multilingual campaigns targeting tourists/foreigners MSM

**How**

- **Bio-medical prevention**

- **Structural prevention**

- **Campaigns**

---

**Limitations**: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.
**City Profile**
LJUBLJANA (Slovenia)

### Testing and Treatment

**HIV test in the last year**
- Among <25: 39.5%
- Among 25+: 47.1%
- Overall: 45.4%

**Treatment**
- Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results:
  - Overall: 78.6%

### Behaviour

**Condom use**
- Among <25: 57.6%
- Among 25+: 47.1%
- Overall: 49.5%

### Prevention

**HIV prevention programmes**
- Among <25: 48.5%
- Among 25+: 50.9%
- Overall: 50.4%

### Social context

**Perceived homo-negativity**
- At work/school: 21.9%
- By parents: 29.5%
- By friends: 5.5%

**“Outness”**
- Overall: 26.3%

**Sexual satisfaction**
- Satisfied: 73.3%
- Unsatisfied: 26.7%

### Recommendations

**Bio-medical prevention**
- Continue to provide Treatment as Prevention (TasP) and Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP).
- Consider to provide Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP).

**Structural prevention**
- Improve condom distribution
- Improve testing offering (community based testing)

**Campaigns**
- Promote HIV testing uptake among MSM
- Continue to implement prevention campaigns targeting MSM

**Limitations**: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey data.
City Profile
SOFIA (Bulgaria)

Testing and treatment

HIV test in the last year
(GARPR 1.13 – Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment (proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment)

| Overall | 100.0% |

Behaviour

Condom use
(GARPR 1.12 – Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex with a male partner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevention

HIV prevention programmes
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reached with HIV prevention programmes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social context

Perceived homo-negativity
(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work/school</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By parents</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By friends</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Outness” (Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)

| Overall | 36.5% |

Sexual satisfaction (WHO indicator on sexual health)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIV – STIs

HIV prevalence
(GARPR 1.14 – HIV prevalence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among &lt;25</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among 25+</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

What

Bio-medical prevention
- Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

Structural prevention
- Improve condom distribution
- Improve testing offering (community based testing)

Campaigns
- Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
- Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
- Promote information and testing uptake among migrant Sex Workers – MSM
- Improve funding for prevention campaigns and programmes

How

Limitations: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution.
For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey

Data are based on 2013 TLS survey, on unweighted estimates with 95% CI
City Profile
STOCKHOLM (Sweden)

Testing and treatment

HIV test in the last year
(GARPR 1.13 – Percentage of MSM who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment
(proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behaviour

Condom use
(GARPR 1.12 – Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIV prevention programmes
(GARPR 1.11 – Percentage of MSM reached with HIV prevention programmes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevention

HIV prevalence
(GARPR 1.14 – HIV prevalence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social context

Perceived homo-negativity
(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work/school</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By parents</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By friends</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Outness” (Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual satisfaction (WHO indicator on sexual health)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

What

Structural prevention
- Maintain condom distribution

Campaigns
- Continue promote condom use
- Continue promote testing offering (outreach/community based testing and health-care based testing)

How

Limitations: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II TLS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey. Data are based on 2013 TLS survey, on unweighted estimates with 95% CI.
## City Profile
### VERONA (Italy)

### Testing and treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV test in the last year</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>50.2%</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>47.3%</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>47.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Treatment (proportion of known HIV-positive MSM, who are on antiretroviral treatment) Overall | 80.5% |

### Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condom use</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>55.7%</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>63.9%</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>61.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(GARPR 1.12 - Percentage of MSM reporting the use of a condom the last time they had anal sex with a male partner)

### HIV – STIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV prevalence</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>3.8%</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>12.2%</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>9.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Syphilis prevalence (positivity for both TPHA or TPPA or CMIA and RPR: probable active Syphilis) Overall | 5.1% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hepatitis B infection</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>2.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(positivity for HBSAb and HBsAg positive, negativity for HBsAb: acute or chronic infection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hepatitis B vaccination</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>44.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(positivity for HBSAb, negativity for both HBsAg and HBcAb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hepatitis C prevalence</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>5.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(anti-HCV pos)

### Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIV prevention programmes</th>
<th>Among &lt;25</th>
<th>27.7%</th>
<th>Among 25+</th>
<th>39.0%</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>35.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Social climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived homo-negativity</th>
<th>At work/school</th>
<th>35.0%</th>
<th>By parents</th>
<th>33.1%</th>
<th>By friends</th>
<th>12.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Percentage of men reported negative or very negative attitude towards gays or bisexuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-ness</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>38.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Percentage of MSM out to no-one or only a few)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual satisfaction</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>75.6%</th>
<th>Unhappy or not satisfied</th>
<th>24.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(WHO indicator on sexual health)

### Recommendations

**What**

- **Bio-medical prevention**
  - Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

- **Structural prevention**
  - Improve condom distribution
  - Improve testing offering (community based testing)

- **Campaigns**
  - Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
  - Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
  - Promote information and testing uptake among migrant Sex Workers – MSM

**How**

**Limitations:** estimates are based on data from the Sialon II RDS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution. For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.
City Profile
VILNIUS (Lithuania)

**Testing and treatment**

- **HIV test in the last year**
  - Among <25: 38.3%
  - Among 25+: 39.1%
  - Overall: 38.8%

- **Treatment**
  - Overall: 100.0%

**HIV – STIs**

- **HIV prevalence**
  - Among <25: 0.0%
  - Among 25+: 4.6%
  - Overall: 3.4%

- **Syphilis prevalence**
  - Overall: 0.1%

- **Hepatitis B infection**
  - Overall: 3.6%

- **Hepatitis B vaccination**
  - Overall: 22.4%

- **Hepatitis C prevalence**
  - Overall: 0.9%

**Behaviour**

- **Condom use**
  - Among <25: 59.6%
  - Among 25+: 55.3%
  - Overall: 56.6%

**Prevention**

- **HIV prevention programmes**
  - Among <25: 58.4%
  - Among 25+: 30.1%
  - Overall: 37.5%

**Social context**

- **Perceived homo-negativity**
  - At work/school: 31.6%
  - By parents: 46.9%
  - By friends: 16.3%

  - “Outness”
    - Overall: 51.0%

- **Sexual satisfaction**
  - Satisfied: 77.8%
  - Unsatisfied: 22.2%

**Recommendations**

**What**

- Bio-medical prevention
  - Make Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP), Treatment as Prevention (TasP), Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) available

- Structural prevention
  - Improve condom distribution
  - Improve testing offering (community based testing)

- Campaigns
  - Implement prevention campaigns targeting young MSM
  - Implement campaigns on STIs other than HIV (Syphilis and HBV-HCV)
  - Promote information and testing uptake among migrant Sex Workers – MSM

**How**

- Limitations: estimates are based on data from the Sialon II RDS survey. Findings have to be interpreted with caution.
  For detailed information on data analysis and results, please consult the Deliverable 9 – Report on bio-behavioural survey.

Data are based on 2013-14 RDS survey, on unweighted estimates with 95% CI.
Annex 1

Sialon II contribution to the implementation of the EU HIV/AIDS policy Framework

The Commission Communication on “Combating HIV/AIDS in the European Union and neighbouring countries (2009-2013)” represents a key background document for EU actions tackling HIV/AIDS (European Commission, 2009). The Communication is complemented by an Operational Action Plan which has recently been updated to cover the period 2014-2016 (European Commission, 2014). This Action Plan stresses the importance of reducing new HIV infections across all European countries, of improving access to prevention, treatment, care and of improving the quality of life of people living with HIV/AIDS. The Action Plan targets both European Union and neighbouring countries.

The document includes a detailed matrix where key areas for intervention are described and – for each area – specific actions are recommended. Such areas include political aspects and the involvement of civil society, prevention components and priority regions and groups.

Moreover, a clear suggestion is included about specific data to be collected in order (i) to improve the knowledge of the HIV epidemic and related factors and (ii) to monitor and to evaluate both the epidemiological situation and the prevention activities.

Additional priority areas are also included in the Action Plan, such as the urgency of tackling discrimination in relation to HIV/AIDS, the need for improving the access to voluntary testing (and treatment) and for reinforcing the behavioural surveillance component across EU and neighbouring countries.

The Sialon II project, although originally designed and approved for funding in 2010, already embraced the core recommendations which are currently laid down in the Commission Communication and in the updated Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>The Sialon II project contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Politics, policies and involvement of civil society, wider society and stakeholders** | To put the HIV/AIDS as an issue requiring special attention | Strengthening (and in some cases building) the network among Public Health bodies and NGOs working in the field of HIV/AIDS, contributing to HIV/AIDS policies and strategies  
Promoting an HIV/AIDS debate from different perspectives (scientific, public health, LGBTI rights) and at different levels (international and European organisations, national, regional and local institutions, community)  
Organisation of dissemination events at local level, including the participation in national/international conferences  
Preparation of future scientific publications |
| To promote a solid collaboration among Commission, Member States, Neighbouring countries, Civil Society and International Organisations |                                                                                     | Setting up of a collaboration among the European Commission, relevant European and International Organisations (namely ECDC, WHO, UNAIDS), as well as members of MSM communities, and other stakeholders (Public Health Bodies, Universities, Hospitals, local Health Services) among the participating countries |
| To promote Civil Society involvement                                |                                                                                     | Active involvement of the civil society (LGBTI – MSM NGOs) not only in planning and implementing the project but also in delivering the main results at the local level  
**Networking among NGOs from different EU and neighbouring countries** (Armenia, Moldova) in a capacity-building perspective |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Implementing an EU project in 13 countries combining targeted prevention with meaningful HIV surveillance among MSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embedding the prevention strategies in the context of a multi-site bio-behavioural survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basing the prevention strategies on a solid formative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing HIV transmission and risk behaviours</td>
<td>Foreseeing testing and a prompt referral to health care services as part of prevention actions (during the TLS and RDS surveys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing in highlighting the different prevention needs among MSM living in the participating cities (formative research and survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing in highlighting the specific segmentation and the complexity of the MSM populations across participating countries, providing also useful indications for additional HIV prevention and health promotion interventions by subgroups to be implemented in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing in increasing condom&amp;lube distribution (prevention campaigns and info-packs) and the uptake of HIV testing (TLS-RDS survey) across the study sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority regions and settings

Targeting priority regions such as the **Eastern European Member States and the neighbouring countries**

Setting up a wide network, including non-EU countries such as Armenia and Moldova, contributing to strengthening the networking and common actions

Contributing to a know-how exchange (on prevention activities, bio-behavioural surveys and laboratory components targeting medical and NGO staff) in line with a capacity building approach, reinforcing the knowledge and skills in the priority regions

### Priority groups

Targeting the priority group of **Men who have Sex with Men (MSM)**

Designing and implementing a specific project focusing on prevention and research targeting MSM in 13 EU countries

Identifying the **segmentation and the complexity of the MSM population**, providing useful indications regarding the necessity to design targeted HIV prevention and health promotion interventions by subgroups

Identifying specific characteristics (including risk behavioural patterns) and prevention needs of specific MSM sub-groups, such as **young MSM, migrants, tourists, minorities (ethnic background) commercial sex workers** and the **MSM who have sex with female partners** (“bridging population”)
| Improving the knowledge | Improving knowledge in terms of **research**, **health care staff** skills and **surveillance** know-how |

Adopting the Second Generation Surveillance Systems (SGSS) approach along with the use of common core indicators (GARPR), strengthening the **know-how** in terms of **surveillance strategies** (**bio-behavioural surveys, sampling methods, testing methods**) targeting high-risk or hidden populations such as the MSM.

**Training** and adopting a common strategy in **laboratory based testing** for HIV and other STIs (in particular oral fluid HIV testing), improving technical skills and knowledge among the Sialon II institutions (local laboratories).

Improving capacities and knowledge of medical staff with regards to **HIV/AIDS and co-infections** prevention, testing, treatment and care including a wider **dissemination of clinical best practices**.
| Improving knowledge about risky behaviours and epidemiological data | Providing robust, reliable, and valid bio-behavioural data on the HIV epidemic in each participating country, in line with highest ethical standards in project design, implementation, and evaluation, thanks also to the supervision of the EC, ECDC, WHO and UNAIDS

Providing a trustworthy source of relevant and comparable data for public health authorities (PHAs) and NGOs in each partner country to develop and inform HIV prevention strategies and actions

Providing data and insights regarding (as examples): access to prevention programs and testing in each partner country, results on sexual behaviour amongst MSM in the last six months (with steady and non-steady partners) including condom use and “fisting”; as well as findings relating to commercial sex, HIV and other STIs, treatment and viral load, substance (mis)use, and sexual health (sexual satisfaction, sexual safety, and sexual autonomy)

Providing specific estimates on HIV prevalence and incidence (Avidity Index calculation for HIV)

Providing specific estimates on undiagnosed infections

Providing specific estimates co-infections including HIV-Syphilis, HIV-HBV, and HIV-HCV |
Improving knowledge in prevention actions

Including **prevention experiences and suggestions** in a specific Sialon II Prevention Report, contributing to the state-of-the-art of the current prevention “best practices” across the participating countries.
| Monitoring and evaluation | Planning and implementing a project survey specifically designed on the principles of the **Dublin Declaration**  
Planning and implementing a project survey specifically designed in line with the **Global AIDS Response Progress Reporting (GARPR) indicators** across the participating countries  
Providing ECDC with a specific document in 2014, summarising the GARPR data obtained through the Sialon II bio-behavioural surveys. **The Sialon II data has been included as significant part of the Thematic Report focusing on MSM and published by ECDC in 2015** (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2015)  
Including the **GARPR indicators on prevention programmes** providing comprehensive evidence on the need for future interventions, contributing to the monitoring and evaluation process of the prevention actions across Europe |

### Bibliography


Present and future challenges in talking HIV epidemic

The reality of the AIDS response is shifting rapidly; while the spread of HIV remains an important public health issue in Europe and globally it should not be considered only an epidemiological matter, a funding reality, or a medical issue: these are no longer the only drivers of the response to the epidemic. If AIDS is to end as a public health threat, a wider consideration of the epidemic is needed to bridge the gaps between the evidence and the political priorities and choices, at city, country, European level as well as globally. The HIV bio-behavioural survey among MSM in key cities shows a considerable trend that needs to be considered further.

Few studies consider behavioural and biological data in line with the so-called Second Generation Surveillance System (SGSS) criteria and UNGASS indicators, and no studies couple the results with the UNAIDS political scenarios. The political scenarios assess the complexity of the context in which the response should be effective; including the elements of stigma, legal framework, community leadership, political instability and conflicts, human rights etc. Considering the context in which the epidemic takes place allows for preparedness and strengthening of the response. From the results of the bio-behavioural survey of the SIALON II project and the UNAIDS Scenarios for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) the following policy recommendations should be considered in future studies:

- A clear change in the socio-political context, for example a shift in marginalisation of vulnerable groups, might affect the AIDS prevalence among key populations and the future AIDS response significantly. An in-depth analysis of the socio-cultural drivers in the region among key populations should be conducted. Our scenarios work has suggested a significant range of societal barriers against MSM and other sexual minorities. These barriers are formed by the social constructs around what constitutes socially acceptable behaviour and the extent to which it is admissible to discriminate against groups displaying such behaviour.
- The existing UNAIDS scenarios could be used to link regional and global priorities to move beyond the epidemiological data and instead appeal to the political discourse, providing a tool for decision-making. Specific drivers of the epidemic and priorities such as the Extent to which HIV is a priority for decision makers, or the degree of shared understanding of personal/cultural/spiritual values, could be further researched and considered in the context of MSM in cities.
• City-specific scenarios for the future might give a wider understanding of the possible future changes and provide a Litmus test for resilience when planning for an effective response, building in flexibility for an effective prevention and preparedness strategy.

An important follow-up to Sialon II would be integration and cross-referencing of the data; for example: what proportions of surveyed people have an HIV-status different to what they expect (i.e. are positive, despite reportedly having been tested previously, despite knowledge of where to get tested, and despite access to prevention services). This is important to understand the effectiveness of the services, the relative ineffectiveness, the potential hurdles to access services and the truthfulness of the respondents. This would be important information to understand whether prevention programmes actually do work.

The information on the reported partnership in place between Civil Society organisations and the hospitals will provide important proxy information on the general perception with regard to exclusion, stigma and provision of quality services. A standard protocol for partnership formation will be critical in subsequent studies, as well as to policy development aimed at improving services, to ensure that the best partnerships are formed from the onset while reducing the risk for failure at a later stage.

The Sialon 2009 paper suggests the importance of alcohol and the use of illegal drugs. It would have been important to also provide data on these variables in the Sialon II data we have received – this aspect might be relevant in explaining the sustained infection rates.

The purpose of this study is to make a direct assessment of the current state of HIV infections in the MSM groups; the intent has to be to enable change as well as shape European policy and legal frameworks to ensure new infection reduction. In order to make additional contributions we welcome further insights into the proposed discussion and analysis of Sialon II data. According to the UNAIDS Political scenarios in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region the table below highlights the three main priorities that need to be considered concurrently.

Finally, experimental ideas could be explored in a dynamic city setting, to reduce the risks or impact of discrimination; for example the use of robotic interfaces to receive and examine patients, prescribe medicines and carry out any follow-ups.

---
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