

1 **Title: Examining the Influence of the Budget Formulation Structures and Processes on the**  
2 **Efficiency of County Health Systems in Kenya**

3  
4 **Short running title: Budget formulation determinants of health system efficiency**

5  
6 **Authors**

7 **First and Corresponding Author:** Anita Musiega

8 **Address:** P.O Box 43640-00100 Nairobi, Kenya

9 **Telephone:** +254718697886

10 **Email address:** amusiega@kemri-wellcome.org

11 **Qualifications:** MSc

12 **Affiliation:** 1) Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme,  
13 Nairobi, Kenya .

14 2) Institute of Healthcare Management, Strathmore University Business School, Nairobi, Kenya.

15  
16 **Second Author:** Benjamin Tsofa

17 **Qualification:** DrPH

18 **Affiliation:** Health Systems and Research Ethics Department, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research  
19 Programme, Kilifi, Kenya

20  
21 **Third Author:** Lizah Nyawira

22 **Qualification:** Msc

23 **Affiliation:** Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme,  
24 Nairobi, Kenya

25  
26 **Fourth Author:** Rebecca G Njuguna

27 **Qualification:** BSc

28 **Affiliation:** 1) Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme,  
29 Nairobi, Kenya

30 2)

31  
32 **Fifth Author:** Joshua Munywoki

33 **Qualification:** BSc

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

34 **Affiliation:** Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme,  
35 Nairobi, Kenya

36

37 **Sixth Author:** Kara Hanson

38 **Qualification:** PhD

39 **Affiliation:** Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,  
40 London, UK

41

42 **Seventh Author:** Andrew Mulwa

43 **Qualification:** MSc

44 **Affiliation:** Directorate of Medical Services, preventive and promotive health, Ministry of  
45 Health, Kenya

46

47 **Eighth Author:** Sassy Molyneux

48 **Qualification:** PhD

49 **Affiliation:** Health Systems and Research Ethics Department, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research  
50 Programme, Kilifi, Kenya

51

52 **Ninth Author:** Isabel Maina

53 **Qualification:** MPH

54 **Affiliation:** Health Financing Department, Ministry of Health, Kenya

55

56 **Tenth Author:** Charles Normand

57 **Qualification:** PhD

58 **Affiliation:** Centre for Health Policy and Management, Trinity College, the University of Dublin,  
59 Dublin, Ireland

60

61 **Eleventh Author:** Julie Jemutai

62 **Qualification:** PhD

63 **Affiliation:** Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Kilifi,  
64 Kenya

65

66 **Twelfth Author:** Edwine Barasa

67 **Qualification:** PhD

68 **Affiliation:** 1) Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme,  
69 Nairobi, Kenya

70 2) Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield department of Medicine, University of  
71 Oxford, Oxford, UK

72 3) Institute of Healthcare Management, Strathmore University Business School, Nairobi, Kenya  
73

74

75 **Acknowledgements:**

76 This work was funded by a MRC/DFID/Wellcome Trust Health Systems Research Initiative (HSRI)  
77 grant no MR/R01373X/1. This work is published with the permission of the Director of KEMRI.

78

79 **Ethics Approval**

80 This study received ethics approval from the KEMRI Scientific and Ethics Review Unit (SERU),  
81 approval number KEMRI/RES/7/3/1.

82

83 **Conflict of Interest:**

84 The authors declare no conflict of interest

85

86 **Abstract**

87 **Introduction**

88 Public Finance Management (PFM) processes guide the translation of government resources to  
89 services and determine health system efficiency. PFM processes are implemented within the  
90 budget cycle which entails the formulation, execution, and evaluation of government budgets. We  
91 examined how the budget formulation structure and processes influence health system efficiency  
92 at the county level in Kenya.

93

94 **Methods**

95 We conducted a mixed methods case study using counties classified as relatively efficient (n=2)  
96 and relatively inefficient (n=2) as our cases. We collected qualitative data through document  
97 reviews, and in-depth interviews (n=70). We collected quantitative data from secondary sources,  
98 including budgets and budget reports. We analyzed qualitative data using the thematic approach  
99 and carried out descriptive analyses on quantitative data.

100

## 101 **Results**

102 Budget ceilings were historically allocated, insufficient, late, or not availed at all. This led to  
103 development of budgets that were unresponsive to health system needs. Counties developed  
104 both programme-based and line budgets with line budgets as the functional budgets. Line budgets  
105 limited accountability and flexibility to reallocate resources. County health funds were fragmented  
106 resulting in duplications and wastage. Limited stakeholder participation compromised priority  
107 setting and social accountability. Priority setting that was not evidence-informed limited efficiency.  
108 Finally, budget changes at the budget approval process compromised alignment of plans to  
109 budgets.

110

## 111 **Conclusion**

112 This study has highlighted six aspects of the budget formulation process in Kenyan counties that  
113 ought to be strengthened to enhance health system efficiency: budget ceilings, budget structure,  
114 participatory budget formulation, pooling of health funds, priority setting processes and the  
115 budget approval process.

116

117 **Key words:** budget formulation, efficiency, and public finance management

118

## 119 **Highlights**

- 120
- 121 • Late and Insufficient budget ceilings lead to development of poorly formulated budgets
  - 122 • Poorly developed and unused programme-based budgets limit health system performance
  - 123 • Fragmented health system funding results in duplication and wastage
  - Limited stakeholder involvement compromised priority setting and accountability

## 124 **Introduction**

125 The effectiveness and alignment of public finance management (PFM) processes to health system  
126 goals are critical determinants of health system performance and the attainment of universal  
127 health coverage (UHC) <sup>1</sup>. PFM refers to the legal and policy framework, systems, and processes  
128 that countries use to mobilize, allocate, spend, and account for public funds <sup>2</sup>. PFM processes are  
129 implemented within the budget cycle that includes the formulation, approval, execution, and  
130 evaluation of government budgets <sup>2</sup>. PFM processes are aimed at enhancing technical efficiency,  
131 allocative efficiency, and fiscal discipline in the use of public financial resources <sup>3</sup>.

132  
133 Within the health system, PFM has been identified as a determinant of efficiency <sup>4</sup>. The efficiency  
134 of health systems refers to the extent to which health system objectives are met with available  
135 resources. Two forms of efficiency are recognized: allocative and technical efficiency. Allocative  
136 efficiency refers to an input-output combination that maximizes outcomes at a given cost <sup>5</sup>, while  
137 technical efficiency on the other hand refers to input minimization for a given output or output  
138 maximization for a given input <sup>5</sup>. Increased efficiency may provide a pathway for the attainment  
139 of UHC by increasing fiscal space for health <sup>6</sup>.

140  
141 Kenya has implemented various interventions to reform its PFM processes across sectors including  
142 health. For example, in line with international best practice, in 2005, Kenya introduced the Medium-  
143 Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEF) to link priorities to activities. The Government of Kenya's  
144 Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) 2012 also came up with multiple reforms for the planning  
145 and budgeting process including the introduction of programme-based budgeting (PBB) with the  
146 aim of strengthening public sector planning and budgeting. PBB was rolled out at the national level  
147 in Financial Year (FY) 2013/14 and at the county level in the 2014/2015 FY <sup>7</sup>. In 2018, PFM processes  
148 at the county were digitized with the implementation of the Integrated Financial Management  
149 Information System (IFMIS).

150  
151 Despite these interventions, some PFM challenges have persisted (7). Various studies have  
152 documented PFM experiences and challenges across the health system in Kenya. At the national  
153 level, one study documented misalignment in the planning and budgeting processes <sup>7</sup>. At the  
154 facility level, there was limited autonomy of health workers in the budgeting process <sup>8</sup> and budgets  
155 were neither transparent nor credible <sup>9</sup>. At the county level there was misalignment of the planning  
156 and budgeting processes <sup>10</sup> and there were challenges with the tools and guidelines to guide the  
157 implementation of the PBB <sup>11</sup>.

158

159 Parallel to the PFM reforms, Kenya devolved its governance arrangements in 2013, creating 47  
160 county governments <sup>12</sup>. The devolution is characterized by fiscal decentralization, with the county  
161 governments receiving funds from national government grants (an equitable share block grant  
162 and conditional grants), mobilizing additional funds from local revenue collection, and having  
163 responsibility for expenditure and reporting <sup>12</sup>. Within the health sector, the national government  
164 retained the policy and regulation role, while the county governments took up health service  
165 delivery, including priority setting and resource allocation for health <sup>12</sup>.

166

167 This paper reports findings of a case study of the influence of PFM processes on health system  
168 efficiency at the county level in Kenya. The study is part of a larger study that assessed the level  
169 and determinants of health system efficiency at the county level in Kenya. In the first phase of the  
170 study, a systematic literature review <sup>13</sup> and stakeholder engagement <sup>14</sup> were conducted that  
171 reported PFM processes as key determinants of health system efficiency globally and at the county  
172 level in Kenya, respectively. In the second phase, a quantitative assessment of county level health  
173 system efficiency and its determinants identified PFM as one of the key determinants of county  
174 level efficiency in Kenya <sup>15</sup>. In this third phase of the study, we explore in-depth how the factors  
175 identified in previous study phases interact with county health system efficiency.

176

177 In this paper, we focus on the first step of the budget cycle, the budget formulation stage in the  
178 Kenyan health sector. This step results in a document that defines government priorities and sets  
179 out the path to meet system objectives <sup>16</sup>. Within Kenyan counties, the process begins with the  
180 release of the budget circular and ends with the passing of the appropriation bill. Weaknesses  
181 within the budget formulation undermine subsequent steps of the budget cycle and ultimately  
182 affect the budget outcomes <sup>16</sup>. Understanding how the budget formulation process may affect the  
183 efficiency of health systems is, therefore, an important research question. While several studies  
184 have described challenges with the budget formulation process in Kenya, these studies have not  
185 analyzed how these challenges influence the efficiency of the health system. Understanding how  
186 processes within budget formulation affect health system efficiency is important informing  
187 interventions to enhance health system efficiency.

188


189 **Methods**

190 **Conceptual Framework**

191 We developed a study conceptual framework based on a literature review of the influence of  
192 budget formulation processes on health system efficiency. The literature review identified 6  
193 budget formulation factors that influence health system efficiency. These are: 1) budget ceilings,  
194 2) budget structure, 3) participatory budget formulation, 4) pooling of resources, 5) priority  
195 setting, and 6) the budget approval process. These six issues were reported to influence the health  
196 system directly or by influencing subsequent processes in the budget cycle. Figure 1 below outlines  
197 the study's conceptual framework that guided the development of study tools and analysis of  
198 study data.

199

200 **Figure 1: Conceptual Framework**



201

202

### 203 **Study design**

204 We conducted a concurrent mixed-methods case study. We used quantitative methods to analyse  
205 secondary data on budgets and qualitative methods to examine stakeholder perceptions about  
206 how budget formulation influences county health system efficiency. The cases for this study were  
207 counties – sub national semi autonomous governments in Kenya.

208

### 209 **Study cases**

210 We purposively selected four counties using the level of health system technical efficiency  
211 reported in phase two of the broader study<sup>17</sup> as a key selection criterion (Table 1). We then took  
212 into consideration other county characteristics that were identified by the quantitative efficiency  
213 analysis as determinants of efficiency. These are population size and the prevalence of HIV/AIDs.

214 That is, we selected counties with varying population size and HIV prevalence. We included four  
 215 cases in our case study. To maintain the confidentiality of the respondents involved in the study,  
 216 we identified the case counties as A, B, C, and D.

217

218 **Table 1: County Characteristics**

County	Efficiency Score*	Population (2019)	Total County Public Health Recurrent Expenditure (2018/2019) KES	Total County Public Health Development Expenditure (2018/2019) KES	Per Capita County Public Health Expenditure (2018/2019) KES	Percentage of public facilities	Percentage of private facilities
A	0.9	1,163,186	1,884,620,000.00	464,900,000.00	1660.190202	62%	38%
B	0.9	990,341	949,629,480	615,371,170	1580.264424	47%	53%
C	0.4	1,131,950	2,121,046,189	370,754,248	2201.334367	63%	37%
D	0.5	315,943	749,054,078	167,564,044	2901.21358	71%	29%

219

220

221 **Data Collection**

222 We collected data using a combination of in-depth interviews and document reviews. We collected  
 223 data between May and October 2021. We purposively selected respondents with knowledge and  
 224 experience of PFM and health system efficiency. The respondents included facility managers,  
 225 county department of health officials, county department of finance officials, national treasury  
 226 officials, ministry of health officials, and donors (Table 2). Two researchers (AM and RK) conducted  
 227 70 IDIs in English using semi-structured interview guides developed based on the budget  
 228 formulation determinants of health system efficiency. All county level IDIs were conducted at the



229 physically while 7 national level IDIs were conducted virtually as per respondents' preference. The  
 230 IDIs were audio-recorded using encrypted audio recorders and lasted between 40-90 minutes.

231

232 **Table 2: Study Respondents**

Interviewee group	County-Level Respondents				National Level Respondents
	A	B	C	D	
Health Managers	4	6	3	3	1
Finance Managers	4	1	2	5	1
Sub County Health Managers	0	3	2	0	-
Facility Health Managers	7	9	5	9	-
Donors	-	-	-	-	6
Sub totals	15	19	12	17	8
Total	<b>70</b>				

233

234 We then reviewed budgeting and planning documents for all the four counties for the FY 2018/2019  
 235 and national level policy documents on PFM (Table 3).

236

237 **Table 3: Documents Reviewed**

Documents Type	Total Reviewed
County Votebooks 17/18	3
County Votebooks 18/19	3
County Fiscal Strategy Paper 18/19	4
County Budget Review and Outlook Paper 18/19	1
County Budget Operationalization Manual	1
Public Finance Management Act	1
Public Finance Management Guidelines	1

County Governments Budget Implementation Review Reports	1
County Audit Reports FY 18/19	4

238

239 **Data analysis**

240

241 Analysis of the data followed a thematic approach. Thematic analysis is a method that guides the  
 242 identification, organization, description, analysis, and reporting of themes found in a data set <sup>18</sup>.  
 243 We immersed ourselves in the data by repeatedly reading through the transcripts. We then  
 244 developed a thematic framework based on the conceptual framework developed in the literature  
 245 review, while accommodating emerging themes. Data from the budget process helped to  
 246 contextualize findings from the review of documents and qualitative interviews. We also held  
 247 reflexive sessions where we presented initial findings to researchers and policymakers.

248

249 **Results**

250

251 In this section, we first present an overview of the budget formulation process in county health  
 252 systems in Kenya, then we present the following six aspects of the budget formulation process  
 253 that we found to influence efficiency: budget ceilings, budget structure, pooling of resources,  
 254 participatory budget formulation, priority setting and the budget approval process. A summary of  
 255 our findings per county is outlined in table 4.

256

257 **Table 4: Summary Findings per case study county**

Issue reviewed	County A	County B	County C	County D
Mechanism for ceiling allocation	Estimates of requirements	Estimates of requirements	Historical	Historical
Timeliness of ceiling	Timely	Late or not issued at all	Not issued at all	Timely
Budget ceiling amount	Less than the recommended 30% of total county budget	More than the recommended 30% of total county budget	More than the recommended 30% of total county budget	Less than the recommended 30% of total county budget
Cascading of ceilings to lower planning units	Partially cascaded	Not cascaded	Not cascaded	Partially cascaded
Budget structure in use	Line-item budget	Line-item budget	Line-item budget	Line-item budget

Alignment of plans and budgets	Aligned	Misaligned	Misaligned	Misaligned
Disclosure of off budget partner envelopes	Partially disclosed	Not disclosed	Not disclosed	Not disclosed
Funds pooled or fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented
Public participation through facility boards and committees	Fully implemented	Partially implemented	Not implemented	Partially implemented
Involvement of facility managers in planning and budgeting	Partially involved	Partially involved until October 2020	Not involved	Partially involved
Priority setting criteria	Revenue maximization at facility level Development Plan goals at county level	Political demands	Political demands	Political demands
Budget reprioritization during approval	Minimal Changes	Budget is reprioritized	Budget is reprioritized	Budget is reprioritized

258

259 **Overview of the budget formulation process**

260

261 Kenya's fiscal year starts on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July and ends on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June of the next calendar year.  
 262 From the policy and legal documents reviewed, the county treasuries release the budget circular  
 263 by 31<sup>st</sup> August of every year marking the beginning of the budget formulation process. The budget  
 264 circular contains key activities and deadlines for the budget process and guidelines for preparing  
 265 the MTEF budget. The department of finance is also required to submit the Annual Development  
 266 Plan (ADP) to the County Assembly (CA) and a copy to the commission on revenue allocation by 1<sup>st</sup>  
 267 September. The county ADP consolidates sector/departmental ADPs. The department of finance  
 268 then prepares the County Budget Review and Outlook Paper (CBROP) which is then submitted to  
 269 the county executive committee (CEC) and CA by 30<sup>th</sup> September. The CBROP should be published  
 270 by November. The CBROP assesses the performance of the previous financial year, and makes  
 271 projections, including proposed budget ceilings, for the next financial year. The CBROP is ideally to  
 272 incorporate the findings of the departmental Annual Performance Review (APR).

273

274 Thereafter, the various sectors, through the Sector Working Groups (SWG) in the county are to  
275 prepare the MTEF budgets which identifies priorities in the medium term (3years). The  
276 departments should then hold sector hearings where they incorporate public views in the MTEF,  
277 thereafter submit it to the department of finance as the final MTEF. By 28<sup>th</sup> February, the  
278 department of finance develops the County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) to the CA. The CFSP  
279 contains the final indicative budget ceilings to the department. The CA is to approve the CFSP by  
280 14<sup>th</sup> March. Thereafter, this is released to departments who are to develop budgets based on the  
281 ceilings and provide proposed budget estimates to the department of finance. The department of  
282 finance should then compile the proposed estimates and submit them to the CA together with the  
283 supporting documents by 30<sup>th</sup> April.


284

285 Between May and June, the CA budget appropriation committee should then conduct public  
286 hearings of the proposed estimates. Thereafter the CA is required to approve the estimates by 30<sup>th</sup>  
287 June, becoming the approved budget (Figure 2)

288

289

290 Figure 2: Budget Formulation Process within Counties in Kenya



291  
292

293 **Budget ceilings**

294 **Across the case study counties, there was a variation in how budget ceilings were determined.** In  
295 counties A and B, ceilings were determined using estimates of financial requirements for health  
296 system inputs (e.g. salaries, drugs). However, in counties C and D, ceilings were determined using  
297 historical allocations. These were adjusted by a percentage in county C, and by the department  
298 budget absorption in county D.

299

300 *“The ceiling is decided based on costs for critical items. These include staff salaries and essential health*  
301 *commodities such as non-pharmaceuticals. It also includes projects that have political priority or are*  
302 *ongoing. For instance, in our county, the construction of the teaching and referral hospital is a political*  
303 *priority for the Governor and has been ongoing. This is prioritized in budgeting to avoid stalling of the*  
304 *project”*County Finance Manager, County B

305

306 Interview respondents reported that the use of historical allocation to determine budget ceilings  
307 limited the budgeting processes’ responsiveness to the changing needs of the county.

308

309 *“Historical budgeting carries forward budget challenges from previous years to subsequent years”*  
310 *County Facility Manager, County C*

311

312 *“Any new activities that were not in the previous budget are not included in the new budget and*  
313 *hence are not funded”* Facility Health Manager, County D

314

315 **Some respondents noted that ceilings to CDoHs were availed late or not at all.** While ceilings were  
316 availed on time in county A and D, they were not availed in county C. Ceilings for county B were  
317 either availed late in some financial years or not at all in others. Respondents reported that ceilings  
318 were not availed because of bureaucratic inefficiency, or because the county treasury made the  
319 final budget on behalf of all the other county departments. Interview respondents across the  
320 counties felt that the timeliness of availing of ceilings to the CDoH influenced efficiency in various  
321 ways. First, ceilings that were not availed limited effective planning within the health sector and  
322 contributed to historical budgeting. For example, in County C, it was reported that in the absence  
323 of budget ceilings, the CDoH limited its planning to the previous year’s budget yet the current years  
324 resource envelope sometimes varied considerably from the previous years. On the other hand, in  
325 County B, it was reported that ceilings that were not availed shifted the decision-making power on

326 priorities to the county treasury and hence reducing the CDoH’s autonomy over health sector  
327 resource allocation.

328

329 *“We did not know the ceiling so we would limit ourselves to the previous figure. As a result, we would  
330 fail to budget for some things. And, even after restricting ourselves to that previous figure we did not  
331 know what ended up in the budget, it is finance that would decide what to include in the final budget  
332 because they had the real ceiling” County Health Manager, County B*

333

334 Secondly, it was felt that late ceilings did not give time for adequate consultation hence key inputs  
335 and information were missed out on the budget. For example, in County B, respondents from the  
336 CDoH reported that they only had one week to compile a budget, as a result, only two people were  
337 involved in determining the needs of the whole county. Because of the time and the few people  
338 involved, they left out important issues in the budget. In county A, the county tried as much as  
339 possible to involve all relevant stakeholders.

340

341 *“Budgeting has become a two-people show involving me and Dr. XXXX. We stay up late trying to  
342 budget for the county. If we had more time, we would budget as a team. A bigger team would bring  
343 diverse views and ensure nothing is left out” County Health Manager County B*

344

345 Thirdly, interview respondents reported that late budgeting limited the use of evidence in the  
346 budgeting process and contributed to historical budgeting. For example, in County B, it was  
347 reported that the budgets for previous years were replicated because they did not have time to  
348 make alternative considerations.

349

350 *“One week is the longest we’ve ever had, so if you look at our previous budgets, they are almost the  
351 same because you don’t have time to think a lot” County Health Manager County B*

352

353 In counties where ceilings were availed on time, respondents reported that this facilitated the  
354 timely processing of the budgets and ultimately, the timely release of funds for activities.

355

356 *“ The budgeting cycle is interrelated, with clearly set timelines. The moment you are late in one  
357 process, the other processes are affected. So timeliness has enabled the smooth flow of the timelines  
358 and the final implementation of the budget” County Finance Manager County D*

359

360 Finally, interview respondents reported that timely ceilings allowed for the early identification of  
 361 budgetary gaps. This gave the county health management team time to source alternative funds  
 362 to bridge the budget gaps.

363

364 *“Spending caps inform us on the budget limits. Thereafter, we can realize budgetary funding gaps.  
 365 We then work with donors to plug in the deficits” Facility Health Manager County A*

366

367 **Respondents in all the counties at both county and facility levels noted that budget ceilings were**  
 368 **not sufficient.** The intergovernmental participation agreement recommends that counties allocate  
 369 a minimum of 30% of the county budget to the CDoH. Document reviews show that allocation levels  
 370 to the health sector varied across counties, with counties B and C exceeding the recommended  
 371 minimum, while counties A and D allocated below the recommended minimum (Table 5).

372

373 **Table 5: Total County Allocation to Health**

	County A	County B	County C	County D	National lowest	National Highest
County Resource Envelope	9,007,239,941	4,373,032,892	7,723,038,775	6,433,026,900	13,535,455,447	4,373,032,892
Department of health ceiling	1,871,704,460	1,646,016,256	2,535,129,951	1,276,382,684	2,344,074,357	1,646,016,256
% allocated to health	<b>20.78%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>38%</b>

374

375 Interview respondents felt that insufficient budget ceilings affected the efficiency of county health  
 376 systems because some activities had to be left out of the budgets and were not implemented.

377

378 *“Sometimes we exhaust the allocation, and we have to operate on credit. Hence, we must limit the  
 379 services. For instance, maternal referrals require a fueled ambulance and an allowance for the  
 380 accompanying nurse. If funds are limited, patients will have to pay for the services out of pocket. But  
 381 often clients are not prepared” Facility Health Manager, County C*

382



383 **Budget ceilings were not cascaded to the lowest planning unit** despite this being a requirement  
384 of the county budget operationalization manual. For example, in counties A and D, only ceilings for  
385 donor funds were cascaded down to level 2 and 3 (primary level) facilities while in counties B and  
386 C no ceilings were cascaded down to facilities. Some respondents from the County Health  
387 Management Team (CHMT) felt that it was difficult to cascade ceilings because the ceilings were  
388 not sufficient.

389  
390 The CDoH failure to cascade ceilings to the frontline was felt to influence health system efficiency  
391 in various ways. First, as there was no ceiling, frontline workers made unrealistic plans which were  
392 either partially funded or not funded at all. Also, it was the CDoH rather than the facilities that  
393 decided what was funded, which limited frontline autonomy.

394  
395 *“We are not given a budget ceiling; we budget based on our needs. As a result, budgets are not*  
396 *honored or less than 50% is honored hence we cannot implement our plans. For example, we do not*  
397 *get health products in the required quantities. When we exhaust the available products, patients have*  
398 *to purchase goods and services out of pocket” Facility Health Manager County C*

399  
400 Second, it was felt that failure to cascade down ceilings resulted in ad-hoc short-term budgeting  
401 at the health facilities. Facilities only made budgets when they received funds. This limited long  
402 term planning which was geared towards achieving targets and goals.

403  
404 *"As facilities, we are using a line-item budget, because, a program-based budget would only be*  
405 *appropriate if we have an annual budget, which does not happen in health. Because we are not sure*  
406 *when the money will hit our account. So we only budget when the money hits the account” Facility*  
407 *Health Manager County C*

408

#### 409 **Budget Structure**

410 The Government of Kenya (Kenyan government) budgeting legal and policy framework requires  
411 that entities develop programme-based budgets (PBBs). PBBs link resources to programmes,  
412 activities, and indicators thus enhancing efficiency. During the budget formulation process, the  
413 CDOH made PBBs. Funds for programmes were then broken down into sub-programmes and line  
414 items. Following approval of the budget, and once the budget was uploaded on Integrated  
415 Financial Management System (IFMIS), the finance office then generated a line-item budget which

416 was then issued to the department for implementation. Further, respondents in all the four  
417 selected counties noted that health facilities developed line-item budgets.

418

419 The formulation of line-item budgets was felt to influence health system efficiency in various ways.  
420 First, it was felt that the budget was reduced to a document that financed inputs rather than  
421 outcomes. The budgets were made to mitigate short term input crises rather than achieve sector  
422 goals and objectives

423

424 *“The challenge with line budgets is we ignore some activities. It is a reactive budget, when we run out  
425 of food we buy food, same applies to fuel. Programme-based budgeting is more inclusive, nothing is  
426 left behind. But even if we make programme budgets, we will never get the funds” Facility Health  
427 Manager County C*

428

429 Second, respondents felt that line-item budgets limited accountability for service delivery outputs  
430 and outcomes. It made it difficult to link the budget to programmes that were implemented. The  
431 line budget was a financial accounting document that explained how resources were expensed,  
432 however, it did not provide an opportunity to evaluate indicators.

433

434 *"Itemized budgets are majorly an accounting document which the accounting department can use to  
435 account for e money, but for us now, we cannot link it to the indicators." County Health Manager,  
436 County D*

437

438 **County health budgets were not aligned to plans and targets.** Interview respondents felt that  
439 misaligned budgets and plans affected efficiency in various ways. First, it was felt that performance  
440 indicators were either not included in the PBB or, where they were included, they were linked to  
441 intermediary rather than final health system outputs (Figure 3). This limited the benefits of the PBB  
442 process thereby limiting efficiency. For example, it limited accountability for outputs and  
443 outcomes as resources were allocated but there were no tangible outputs or outcomes attached  
444 to it.

445

446 **Figure 3: Sample county programme-based budget indicating outputs/outcomes**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Programme 3: Preventive and Promotive</b>					
<b>Objective</b>	To increase access to quality promotive, preventive health care services					
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Reduced morbidity and mortality due to preventable causes</b>					
<b>Sub programmes</b>	<b>Delive ry Unit</b>	<b>Key outcomes/outp uts</b>	<b>Key performan ce indicators</b>	<b>Targets</b>		
				<b>2018/1 9</b>	<b>2019/2 0</b>	<b>2020/2 1</b>
Preventive and Promotive						
Licensing and control of undertaking						
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Programme4: Construction and rehabilitation of health facilities.</b>					
<b>Objective</b>	<b>To promote access to health care</b>					
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Health community</b>					
<b>Sub programmes</b>	<b>Delive ry Unit</b>	<b>Key outcomes/outp uts</b>	<b>Key performan ce indicators</b>	<b>Targets</b>		
				<b>2018/1 9</b>	<b>2019/2 0</b>	<b>2020/2 1</b>
4.1 Construction and rehabilitation		Constructed and renovated health facilities	No of facilities constructed / rehabilitate d	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	20

447

448 Secondly, respondents felt that the misalignment of plans with budgets led to a mismatch in the  
 449 inputs available to the health system leading to wastage of resources. The input combination was  
 450 targeted to maximize expenditure contained in the budget rather than outcomes which were in  
 451 the plan. This resulted in an input mix that could not deliver the intended outcomes. For example,  
 452 in county C, the government provided cervical cancer vaccines but did not budget for resources to  
 453 conduct vaccination within schools to ensure vaccines reach the population. As a result, the  
 454 vaccines expired.

455

456 *“At the moment, we have 48 closed laboratories, because of staff [shortage]. The infrastructure and*  
 457 *equipment is lying there unutilized because we don't have staff yet we present our needs every year*  
 458 *in the annual work plan” County Health Manager County C*

459

460 Third, respondents felt that misalignment between plans and budgets had a negative impact on  
 461 health outcomes.

462

463 *“Because XXXX borders the game park, we have many fatal snake bites. So in our annual work plan,*  
464 *we report the number of deaths and plan to purchase anti-snake venom. We have been putting this*  
465 *in our annual work plan for the past three years, but the county has never provided the anti-venom”*  
466 *Sub County Health Manager County C*

467

468 Finally, misalignment in plans and budgets was felt to compromise accountability for results.  
469 Monitoring and evaluation of budgets against indicators could not be accomplished.

470

471 *“We can’t evaluate indicators because the activities of the indicators do not go hand in hand with the*  
472 *financing. The only indicator that you can evaluate are the donor funded ones.*  
473 *If donors support reproductive maternal and child health, they are very clear on the specific indicators*  
474 *that they chase alongside that budget.” County Health Manager County D*

475

#### 476 **Pooling of resources**

477

478 **Respondents noted that one key challenge for pooling across the various funding streams was**  
479 **the donors’ failure to disclose their budgets.** In all four counties, only two donors provided on-  
480 budget support to the counties and hence disclosed their resource envelopes (the World Bank and  
481 Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)). In county C, some respondents felt that the  
482 failure to disclose resource envelopes was because of fears of interference from political leaders.  
483 It was reported that if donors were to disclose their resource envelopes, then local leaders such as  
484 the MCAs would want to skew the allocation of resources to their advantage rather than the health  
485 system’s advantage. Another reason given by donors was that the county expected information  
486 from them, but the counties were not forthcoming with information, they stressed the need for a  
487 two-sided rather than one-sided relationship.

488

489 Failure to provide budgets was felt to affect health system efficiency in multiple ways. First, it was  
490 felt to undermine the priority setting process, as departments were either uncertain about  
491 allocating activities to donors who did not disclose their envelopes, or they made incorrect  
492 assumptions about the level and support of donors thereby leaving out key activities from their  
493 budget.

494

495 *“Undisclosed envelopes are a problem because we make lots of assumptions when budgeting. For*  
496 *example, we do not budget for HIV and TB with the assumption that they are covered by a donor or*

497 *the national government. But sometimes not everything is done yet on the budget we omitted it.*  
498 *Besides there is a danger of duplication, this is worse because that money could have funded other*  
499 *activities” County Health Manager County B*

500

501 Second, it was felt that it led to duplication of activities. This led to the wastage of resources, yet  
502 some key activities remained unfunded. For example, donors provided commodities that health  
503 facilities had already purchased, and they had no option but to accept the commodities. Also,  
504 donors facilitated outreach activities that facilities had already included in their budgets. While the  
505 facilities appreciated the input, they had to go through a long process to reallocate the budgeted  
506 funds.

507

508 Third, interview respondents stated that they were unaware of the donor support and this limited  
509 sustainability of the donor implemented activities. For example, in county D, it was reported that  
510 while the county received a lot of support, the county government was unaware of this as the  
511 donors did not disclose their envelopes.

512

513 *“Donors provide a lot of support, but this is not felt because they do not disclose their contribution.*  
514 *For instance, within the nutrition department, organizations like XXX and XXX support us with*  
515 *nutrition commodities, they spend a lot of money but the county is unaware of the value. If the donors*  
516 *pulled out today, the county may not be able to take over because they lacked full information”*

517 *County Health Manager County D*

518

519 **Funding to the CDoH was through fragmented channels.** The funding sources for the four CDoHS  
520 can be categorized into three: exchequer allocations, county own source revenue, and donor  
521 support. The exchequer support came in various forms. These included routine allocations  
522 (comprised of development budget and recurrent budgets) and conditional grants. The  
523 conditional grants were mainly for user fee foregone by primary health centers and grants to  
524 county tertiary health (level 5) facilities. None of the four counties included in the study received a  
525 county tertiary health facility grant. Own source revenue, on the other hand, was funds generated  
526 from various activities for the health sector. These included user fees, and insurance funds such  
527 as Linda mama (an MOH insurance for all pregnant mothers in Kenya), Edu Afya (MOH insurance  
528 for all Kenyan school children), National Health Insurance Fund (NHIF) capitation and fee for  
529 service reimbursements. Donor support came through either on-budget support or off-budget  
530 support. On budget support was from two sources i) the World Bank *transforming health systems*

531 (THS) funds to the counties in general for improving Reproductive Maternal Neonatal Adolescent  
532 and Child Health (RMNCAH), and ii) the Danish DANIDA conditional grant to improve primary  
533 healthcare facilities. Off-budget support also came in multiple ways, some through direct financing  
534 via cheques to County Health Management Teams (CHMTs) commercial bank accounts, and in-kind  
535 support through the provision of inputs.

536

537 Fragmented financing of the health system was felt to be affecting health systems efficiency in  
538 various ways. First, it was reported that different sources of funds targeting specific areas of  
539 implementation led to the fragmented achievement of health system goals. For example, in  
540 County D, it was reported that one facility was unable to meet Immunization goals for the Bacillus  
541 Calmette Guerin (BCG) vaccine because they did not have a maternity wing. The funds they had  
542 could not be used for the construction of a maternity wing as they targeted only immunization  
543 activities. In County B also at the county level, the RMNCAH indicators were doing very well as they  
544 were supported by the donors, but other areas lagged.

545

546 Second, it was felt that fragmented funding sources led to fragmented decision-making for budget  
547 priorities. This resulted in duplication of activities and therefore wastage of resources. It also  
548 provided a loophole for informal priority setting which led to inefficiencies.

549

550 *“We advise MCAs to have one model facility to serve people across political areas, however, they will*  
551 *hear none of it. Every MCA wants a facility for their area, even if there is a facility within a 1-kilometer*  
552 *radius of the population. The MCAs will go ahead and allocate finances to construct a facility in that*  
553 *location. When the CDoH disputes the allocation, the MCAs reallocate the funds to other departments*  
554 *therefore the health department loses out. Having fragmented development funds for administrative*  
555 *wards is a wrong model, all these resources should be under the CDoH” County Health Manager*  
556 *County B*

557

558 Finally, respondents felt that multiple accountability channels for the different resources led to  
559 challenges with accountability. For example, in county B, MCAs put support in the very same  
560 activities that were supported by donors. Thereafter they did not implement the activities  
561 budgeted by the counties, yet they still consumed the resources.

562

563 *“I thought our county is bad, but I am informed that other counties are worse. Some counties own*  
564 *the donor-funded projects, they claim they paid for the project. Of course, we lose out. Someone will*

565 *gain, someone will be paid. There was no contractor but someone said they did work which was done*  
566 *by someone else so, in essence, it is a double payment but because the processes are sort of*  
567 *independent whatever returns will be made to the donor and whatever returns will be made to the*  
568 *county they may never meet" County Health Manager County B*

569

570 While there were several inefficiencies from fragmented funds, interview respondents felt that  
571 fragmented financing also helped the health facilities especially when the main source of funds  
572 were unreliable. Alternative financing sources such as off-budget donors, Linda Mama and NHIF  
573 came in handy.

574

575 *"Other counties are performing. So, it makes us question the priorities of our county. Were it not for*  
576 *MSF providing services at the county hospital ...it would also be down and under. The county is over-*  
577 *reliant on MSF aid, for things that the county itself should be providing ..."* Facility Health Manager  
578 County C

579

#### 580 **Participatory budget formulation**

581

582 The Kenyan government legislative framework requires a participatory budget process. In the  
583 period prior to devolution of healthcare services, the Ministry of Health (MOH) constituted  
584 mechanisms for structured community involvement in decision-making within health facilities  
585 through health facility management boards and committees. These boards and committees  
586 involved community members and frontline health workers in the budget and planning process.

587

588 *"... there shall be openness and accountability, including public participation in financial matters" –*  
589 *Constitution of Kenya 2010*

590

591 From the document reviews, however, we found that the devolved government system  
592 introduced public participation into the budgeting process through sector working groups (SWG)  
593 and public barazas, in addition to the facility committees and boards. Interviews with county-level  
594 respondents reported that the health SWGs in most of the counties were not functional.

595

596 **The respondents felt that while the public was involved in budget formulation, their involvement**  
597 **was unstructured.** Public participation was felt to influence health system efficiency in various  
598 ways. First, it ensured that the health budget was responsive to the needs of the population. For



599 example, in county C, it was reported that the public was keen that all the implemented activities  
600 were responsive to their needs.

601

602 *"I have been in this system for 30 years but for the last 10 years, people have been very alert. You  
603 cannot go to the community and implement projects that are not in tandem with community  
604 expectations, they will reject the project. The days when doctor's word was final are long gone"*  
605 *County Health Manager, County C*

606

607 Second, it was felt that the public was able to lobby for more resources on behalf of the county  
608 health department.

609

610 *"they're [the public] the ones who lobby the county government to bring new projects to our facility"*  
611 *Facility Health Manager County B*

612

613 Third, respondents felt that unstructured public participation led to conflicts between provider  
614 needs and community needs. For example, in County D, the finance department noted that there  
615 were differences between the public and facility needs, and finance had the responsibility to  
616 balance the different requests.

617

618 *"There are these public participation forums that the county holds, we as the health workers, rarely  
619 attend. They are held when we are at work. Therefore, our views are not factored in, yet as a service  
620 provider we know what is needed to improve outcomes"* Facility Manager County D

621

622 Respondents noted that before devolution, the MOH had clear structures that defined how the  
623 public was involved in the budgeting and planning process. However, some counties such as  
624 county D did not fully adopt the process, especially in sub-county hospitals.

625

626 **Frontline workers were involved in the planning process during the development of the Annual**  
627 **Work Plan (AWP) but they were not involved in developing the PBB.** In all four counties, the  
628 county health management team (CHMT) made all the decisions regarding budgets. The sub-  
629 county health management teams and the facility in-charges were left out of the budgeting  
630 process.

631



632 *“It is a problem because we are the key makers concerning budget. We must start from down going*  
633 *up. But often, I don't know if what I budgeted for was captured on the major budget. Is there a match*  
634 *or a mismatch on it, I can't tell”?* Facility Manager County B

635

636 Failure to involve the frontline workers was felt to affect health system efficiency in various ways.  
637 First, most facilities had never seen the county budget and had no idea what was being  
638 implemented in the county. This limited accountability at the facility and county level.

639

640 *“they’ll procure drugs and non-pharmaceuticals worth say 90,000,000 for the whole county. But you*  
641 *can’t know exactly how much was spent on your facility. You can estimate based on the drawing*  
642 *rights but you can't be 100% sure that this is the money that was spent on my facility.”* Facility Health  
643 *Manager, County A*

644

645 Second, it was felt that because facilities were unclear about what was being implemented, they  
646 were unable to effectively evaluate their achievements against budgets.

647

648 *“We can evaluate revenue from NHIF that we collect and spend at source and put in place measures*  
649 *to improve performance. But it’s hard to evaluate what the county probably spends on us”* Facility  
650 *Health Manager, County A*

651

652 Third, counties ended up making decisions that were not consistent with the needs of the health  
653 facilities. Blanket decisions wasted resources. For example, in county A, the department was not  
654 able to access materials for the orthopedic department because it was not something that was  
655 commonly used in the county, yet for their facility, this was an important need. The facility had an  
656 orthopedic surgeon whose skills would be wasted if these materials were not availed.

657

658 *“ They need to involve us, otherwise they waste resources. They should ask us, what do you need?*  
659 *What is not important? what will improve your performance? Other than just pushing, because yes,*  
660 *you’ve bought me drugs worth 2 million drugs, but what if my catchment population does not match*  
661 *the drugs that you bought me?”* Facility Health Manager, County C

662

663 Overall, both public and facility involvement was said to improve transparency. Improved  
664 transparency enabled efficiency by enhancing accountability for results.

665

666 “To me, I think facility and public involvement is the best way of practice for accountability and  
667 transparency, that’s the best way to become accountable. Whatever we are doing, everybody needs  
668 to be at par, they should know what is happening within the system.” Facility Manager County B

669

#### 670 **Priority setting and resource allocation criteria**

671 The priority setting process was not evidence-based. Participants noted that priorities for the  
672 recurrent budget were decided based on historical expenditure and lobbying, while priorities for  
673 development budget were set based on demands from political leaders which had a bias towards  
674 visible infrastructure expenditure that enhanced positive citizen perception about their  
675 performance as politicians. For example, it was reported that politicians prioritized the  
676 construction of new health facilities without considering the population demand for health  
677 services. As a result, the CDOH had developed more health facilities than were needed to meet the  
678 population demand for facility-based health services and stretched the other limited resources  
679 such as human resource for health.

680

681 “They [MCAs] say they want health centers. Right now, I’ve got about 30 health facilities which are  
682 complete. But, I’m not able to equip or staff. Every MCA wants to tell the electorate I have built this  
683 one, but why have a facility that is not functional? I hope as we mature in devolution, they’ll  
684 understand that facilities should be constructed, in accordance with the population and the county’s  
685 ability to staff and to equip them” County Health Manager County B

686

687 Second, the need to maximize revenue meant that the income generating departments were given  
688 priority over other departments. For example, in county A, hospitals had access to only one source  
689 of fund - reimbursement for maternal deliveries dubbed “Linda mama”. As this was their only  
690 source of funds, they prioritized the allocation of budgets to the maternity department to raise  
691 more revenue. In some cases, this happened at the expense of other health system needs and  
692 goals.

693

694 “For Linda mama funds, priorities mainly goes towards the maternal care, their priorities are  
695 considered first. If they want a baby and mother package, we must budget for that. Basically, they  
696 have more power to decide what they want to do within the department. The other departments only  
697 benefit if they support maternity” Facility Health Manager County A

698

#### 699 **Budget approval process**

700 **Budgets were reprioritized during approval.** As the budget went through the county treasury, the  
701 county executive, and the assembly, some health priorities were changed without the knowledge  
702 of the county department of health. Respondents noted that the changes further misaligned the  
703 budget from the plans. While the county executive made changes to the budget, these changes  
704 were not reflected in the developed plans. Second, in county C, the county assembly reduced the  
705 resources available to the CDOH in the budget approval process further exacerbating the resource  
706 challenges.

707

708 *“The budget has been changing without us knowing. Whatever goes to the assembly is not what we*  
709 *get back. For long, we thought it was the assembly making the changes. But we discussed with the*  
710 *assembly last year and they told us the changes come from the executive”* County Health Manager  
711 County B

712

713 *“...And the budget goes to the county treasury then they, I don’t know what they do if we budget,*  
714 *they reduce our budget and even the one, which is reduced is nowhere to be seen”* County Health  
715 Manager County C

716

## 717 **Discussion**

718 This study examined how the budget formulation process affects health system efficiency at the  
719 county level in Kenya. We report several weaknesses across all the 6 aspects of the budget  
720 formulation process that have potential implications for county health system efficiency. First, we  
721 find that in two counties, budget ceilings were determined using historical allocations. In addition,  
722 ceilings were either late or not forthcoming, insufficient, and not cascaded to lower-level priority  
723 healthcare facilities. These findings resonate with findings from Ghana and Democratic Republic  
724 of Congo (DRC) where ceilings were not indicative<sup>19,20</sup> and Thailand’s civil servant scheme where  
725 ceilings were allocated historically<sup>21</sup>. The historical allocation of budgets undermines health system  
726 efficiency by ignoring the evolution of health sector priorities. When ceilings are not provided or  
727 provided late, it renders the budgeting process moot since budgets are not aligned with the reality  
728 of resource availability. This disempowers health sector units (county department of health, health  
729 facilities) from effectively contributing to the budgeting process with the implication that budgets  
730 will not be aligned with actual health sector needs, thus compromising the optimal use of  
731 resources. When ceilings are insufficient, they compromise efficiency by constraining health  
732 system investments and hence health system input mix with negative implications for health  
733 outcomes. The failure to cascade budget ceilings to peripheral healthcare facilities had the same

734 effect: disempowering these budgeting units from contributing to the budgeting process. Given  
735 that peripheral healthcare facilities predominantly provide primary healthcare (PHC), their  
736 disempowerment in the budgeting process undermines PHC delivery, against a backdrop where  
737 PHC has shown to be cost-effective and hence efficiency enhancing <sup>22</sup>.

738

739 Second, on budget structure, we found that while on paper counties are supposed to use  
740 programme-based budgets, in practice, the budgets are still line-item based. The use of line-item  
741 budgets led to budget rigidities which limited the capacity of counties to respond to emergent  
742 healthcare needs. Further, we found that budgets were not aligned to plans. This echoes previous  
743 findings in Kenya where there was institutionalized misalignment of the planning and budgeting  
744 processes at the national level <sup>23</sup>. Similar findings have also been reported in Lesotho where  
745 budgets and plans were misaligned as they happened under different structures <sup>24</sup>. The  
746 misalignment between budget and plans meant that budgets did not adequately represent health  
747 sector priorities, which could compromise allocative efficiency.

748

749 Third, the limited involvement of front-line service providers and the community in the  
750 development of county health sector budgets and plans led to the misalignment of budgets with  
751 population health priorities and limited budget accountability, with implications for both technical  
752 and allocative efficiency. This limited involvement of frontline providers and the community has  
753 also been documented in previous findings in Kenya where decentralization resulted in limited  
754 hospital autonomy <sup>8</sup>.

755

756 Fourth, we found that the persistence of off-budget donor funding compromised health sector  
757 planning because CDoHS were unaware of the total available resources in the health sector. This  
758 in turn led to duplication of efforts which compromised the technical efficiency of county  
759 governments. This finding is like findings in Sierra Leone where there were multiple funding  
760 sources with multiple bank accounts limiting transparency <sup>16</sup>. We also found that health sector  
761 funding at the county level was fragmented. This is similar to China where there was fragmented  
762 financing of the health system by the government at the national and sub national level <sup>25</sup> <sup>4</sup>.  
763 Fragmented funding limited effective planning and budgeting by limiting pooling of resources and  
764 shifting decision making over resources to entities outside the health sector.

765

766 Fifth, we found that the budget formulation processes were dominated by informal priority setting  
767 criteria such as lobbying. This compromised allocative efficiency of health systems by  
768 compromising the optimal allocation of health sector resources <sup>10,21,26</sup>.

769

770 Lastly, we found that CDoH autonomy was usurped during the budget approval process where the  
771 county treasury and county assembly often revised the budgets without reference to the county  
772 department of health. The reprioritization of budget by the county assembly at the approval stage  
773 without reference to the county department of health and its stakeholder holders disempowered  
774 health sector stakeholders. This had the potential of misaligning final budgets with health sector  
775 priorities and hence compromising both technical and allocative efficiency <sup>4</sup>.

776

777 While most budget formulation challenges such as use of line budgets cut across both efficient  
778 and inefficient counties, some aspects were different. County A, one of the best performing  
779 counties reported more participation of frontline health workers in the budgeting process and  
780 better relationships with off budget donors. County B, another well performing county had the  
781 highest allocation to the health sector, and moderate involvement of the CDOH in planning and  
782 budgeting. County C one of the poor performing counties had significant challenges across all the  
783 areas of the budget process beginning with complete failure to disclose ceilings. County D, another  
784 poor performing also had poor involvement of the CDOH. The findings on PFM practices were  
785 therefore mixed rather than systematically different between the counties that were ranked as  
786 efficient and the ones that were ranked as inefficient by the quantitative efficiency analysis. This  
787 would be because the nature of PFM practices documented are perverse in Kenyan counties, with  
788 differences in degrees across counties that are difficult to tease out using a qualitative approach.  
789 It could also be because the counties that were ranked as efficient by the quantitative analysis by  
790 being on the efficiency frontier are inefficient in absolute terms, even though they are relatively  
791 more efficient than the counties that are at a distance from the efficiency frontier.

792

793 A limitation of this study is the inclusion of only four out of the 47 counties in Kenya. This is  
794 important because budget formulation practices vary across counties. However, as is  
795 characteristic of qualitative case studies, the intention was not to achieve statistical generalization  
796 but rather analytical generalization <sup>27</sup>. A second limitation is the different financial data reported  
797 by the government agencies dealing with the county finance. Reports from the county differ from  
798 those by the controller of budget which also differ from those reported by the national treasury.  
799 We used the most complete data available.

800

801 Despite the limitations, the meta issues identified within this study are analytically generalizable  
802 and we can draw various recommendations from the findings. First, the county treasury should  
803 use the MTEF reports from the county departments as a guide to develop final budget ceilings.  
804 MTEF reports outline the requests of the departments and the public for the health system over a  
805 3year period. Second, the county finance departments should provide timely ceilings to allow  
806 sufficient time for PBB development. The budget process guidelines state that the CFSP containing  
807 the budget ceilings should be approved and disseminated by 14<sup>th</sup> March of the planning year. Third,  
808 counties should allocate enough resources to the health sector. The intergovernmental  
809 collaboration agreement recommends a minimum of 30% of the total county budget allocation to  
810 the CDOH. Fourth, the CDOHs should fully cascade the budget ceilings to the different planning  
811 units and allow each unit to make its own budget as guided by the county financing guidelines.  
812 Fifth, while the counties develop many budget formats, they should use the programme-based  
813 budget as the functional budget as required by the PFMA. Sixth, the CDOHS should develop the  
814 PBB to completion, and ensure that the plans and budgets align. Seventh, health sector  
815 stakeholders should pool all health sector funds from different sources to enhance efficiency. This  
816 can be achieved through empowering the forums created to strengthen joint planning and  
817 budgeting. These include the County Health Stakeholders Forums and the Health Sector Working  
818 Groups. Eighth, public participation should be better structured and guided to ensure that the  
819 public makes informed decisions. Ninth, health workers who are most aware of health system  
820 needs should be at the center of the decision-making process in the health budgeting and planning  
821 process. This can be achieved through strengthening the health facility boards and committees.  
822 Tenth, priorities in the planning and budgeting decisions should be evidence informed. This will  
823 ensure resources are allocated to high impact interventions. Finally, county assembly involvement  
824 in the budget process should be limited to oversight as is required by the legal framework.

825

## 826 **Conclusion**

827 This study examined the relationship between budget formulation and efficiency of county health  
828 systems in Kenya. A key finding is that the budget formulation process influences both technical  
829 and allocative efficiency directly or by influencing the implementation and/or evaluation of the  
830 budget. A well formulated budget is therefore important in ensuring a well implemented and  
831 evaluated budget which will in turn reduce inefficiencies. By enhancing the budget formulation  
832 process, the health system will get more health from the available resources. This study has  
833 highlighted six aspects of the budget formulation process that ought to be strengthened to

834 enhance efficiency; budget ceilings, budget structure, participatory budget formulation, pooling  
835 of health funds, priority setting processes and the budget approval process.



## 836 References

837

- 838 1. World Health Organization. WHO | Financing the health Sustainable Development Goal.  
839 WHO. Published online 2016.
- 840 2. Allen R, Hemming R, Potter B. *The International Handbook of Public Financial Management*.  
841 Vol 66.; 2013.
- 842 3. Schick A. A Contemporary approach to Public Expenditure Management. Published online  
843 1999.
- 844 4. Piatti-Fünfkirchen M, Schneider P. From stumbling block to enabler: The role of public  
845 financial management in health service delivery in tanzania and Zambia. *Health Systems  
846 and Reform*. 2018;4(4):336-345. doi:10.1080/23288604.2018.1513266
- 847 5. Coelli TJ, Rao DSP, O'Donnell CJ, Battes GE. *An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity  
848 Analysis*. Vol 41.; 2005. doi:10.2307/2531310
- 849 6. Zeng W, Yao Y, Barroy H, Cylus J, Li G. Improving fiscal space for health from the  
850 perspective of efficiency in low- and middle-income countries : What is the evidence ?  
851 2020;10(2):1-10. doi:10.7189/jogh.10.020421
- 852 7. Tsofa B, Molyneux S, Goodman C. Health sector operational planning and budgeting  
853 processes in Kenya -"never the twain shall meet". 2015;(March 2015):357-359.  
854 doi:10.1002/hpm
- 855 8. Barasa EW, Manyara AM, Molyneux S, Tsofa B. Recentralization within decentralization:  
856 County hospital autonomy under devolution in Kenya. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12(8):1-18.  
857 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0182440
- 858 9. Kairu A, Orangi S, Mbutia B, Ondera J, Ravishankar N, Barasa E. Examining health facility  
859 financing in Kenya in the context of devolution. *BMC Health Services Research*.  
860 2021;21(1):1086. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-07123-7
- 861 10. Waitthaka D, Tsofa B, Kabia E, Barasa E. Describing and evaluating healthcare priority  
862 setting practices at the county level in Kenya. *International Journal of Health Planning and  
863 Management*. 2018;33(3):e733-e750. doi:10.1002/hpm.2527
- 864 11. Tsofa B, Musotsi P, Kagwanja N, et al. Examining health sector application and utility of  
865 program-based budgeting: County level experiences in Kenya. *International Journal of  
866 Health Planning and Management*. 2021;36(5):1521-1532. doi:10.1002/hpm.3174
- 867 12. Government of Kenya. *Constitution of Kenya*.; 2010. Accessed April 5, 2022.  
868 [www.kenyalaw.org](http://www.kenyalaw.org)
- 869 13. Mbau R, Musiega A, Jemutai J, et al. *Analysing the Efficiency of National and Sub-National  
870 Health Systems-A Review of Literature*.; 2022.
- 871 14. Nyawira L, Mbau R, Jemutai J, et al. Examining Health Sector Stakeholder Perceptions on  
872 the Efficiency of County Health Systems in Kenya. Published online 2020.
- 873 15. Barasa E, Musiega A, Hanson K, et al. Level and determinants of county health system  
874 technical efficiency in Kenya : two stage data envelopment analysis. *Cost Effectiveness and  
875 Resource Allocation*. Published online 2021:1-11. doi:10.1186/s12962-021-00332-1
- 876 16. World Health Organisation. *Building Strong Public Financial Management Systems Towards  
877 Universal Health Coverage : Key Bottlenecks and Lessons Learnt From Country*.; 2018.
- 878 17. Barasa E, Musiega A, Hanson K, et al. Level and Determinants of County Health System  
879 Technical Efficiency in Kenya: Two Stage Data Envelopment Analysis. *Manurcript*.  
880 Published online 2021.
- 881 18. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *ISSN*. 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 882 19. le Gargasson JB, Mibulumukini B, Gessner BD, Colombini A. Budget process bottlenecks  
883 for immunization financing in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). *Vaccine*.  
884 2014;32(9):1036-1042. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.12.036



- 885 20. Abekah-Nkrumah G, Dinklo T, Abor J. Financing the health sector in Ghana: A review of the  
886 budgetary process. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*.  
887 2009;(17):45-59.
- 888 21. Patcharanarumol W, Panichkriangkrai W, Sommanuttawechai A, Hanson K, Wanwong Y,  
889 Tangcharoensathien V. Strategic purchasing and health system efficiency: A comparison of  
890 two financing schemes in Thailand. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13(4):1-13.  
891 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0195179
- 892 22. Anderson M, Averil Albala S, Patel N, Lloyd J. *Building the Economic Case for Primary  
893 Healthcare: A Scoping Review*.; 2018.
- 894 23. Tsofa B, Molyneux S, Goodman C. Health sector operational planning and budgeting  
895 processes in Kenya-"never the twain shall meet". *Int J Health Plann Manage*. 2016;31(3):260-  
896 276. doi:10.1002/hpm.2286
- 897 24. Vian T, Bicknell WJ. Good governance and budget reform in Lesotho Public Hospitals:  
898 Performance, root causes and reality. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2013;29(6):673-684.  
899 doi:10.1093/heapol/czs121
- 900 25. Brixi H, Mu Y, Targa B, Hipgrave D. Engaging sub-national governments in addressing  
901 health equities: Challenges and opportunities in China's health system reform. *Health  
902 Policy and Planning*. 2013;28(8):809-824. doi:10.1093/heapol/czs120
- 903 26. Barasa EW, Cleary S, Molyneux S, English M. Setting healthcare priorities: A description  
904 and evaluation of the budgeting and planning process in county hospitals in Kenya. *Health  
905 Policy and Planning*. 2017;32(3):329-337. doi:10.1093/heapol/czw132
- 906 27. Polit DF, Beck CT. Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: Myths and  
907 strategies. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2010;47(11):1451-1458.  
908 doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2010.06.004  
909



911 **Tables**

912 **Table 1: County Characteristics**

County	Efficiency Score*	Population (2019)	Total County Public Health Recurrent Expenditure (2018/2019) KES	Total County Public Health Development Expenditure (2018/2019) KES	Per Capita County Public Health Expenditure (2018/2019) KES	Percentage of public facilities	Percentage of private facilities
A	0.9	1,163,186	1,884,620,000.00	46490000.00	1660.190202	62%	38%
B	0.9	990,341	949,629,480	615,371,170	1580.264424	47%	53%
C	0.4	1,131,950	2,121,046,189	370,754,248	2201.334367	63%	37%
D	0.5	315,943	749,054,078	167,564,044	2901.21358	71%	29%

913 \*the efficiency score were computed using data envelopment analysis. The measures represent  
 914 relative efficiency of county health system and have a range of 0-1

915

916 **Table 2: Study Respondents**

917

Interviewee group	County-Level Respondents				National Level Respondents
	A	B	C	D	
Health Managers	4	6	3	3	1
Finance Managers	4	1	2	5	1
Sub County Health Managers	0	3	2	0	-
Facility Health Managers	7	9	5	9	-
Donors	-	-	-	-	6
Sub totals	15	19	12	17	8
Total	<b>70</b>				

918

919 **Table 3: Documents reviewed**

920

Documents Type	Total Reviewed
County Votebooks 17/18	3
County Votebooks 18/19	3
County Fiscal Strategy Paper 18/19	4
County Budget Review and Outlook Paper 18/19	1
County Budget Operationalization Manual	1
Public Finance Management Act	1
Public Finance Management Guidelines	1
County Governments Budget Implementation Review Reports	1
County Audit Reports FY 18/19	4

921

922

923 **Table 4: Summary findings per case study county**

Issue reviewed	County A	County B	County C	County D
Mechanism for ceiling allocation	Estimates of requirements	Estimates of requirements	Historical	Historical
Timeliness of ceiling	Timely	Late or not issued at all	Not issued at all	Timely
Budget ceiling amount	Less than the recommended 30% of total county budget	More than the recommended 30% of total county budget	More than the recommended 30% of total county budget	Less than the recommended 30% of total county budget
Cascading of ceilings to lower planning units	Partially cascaded	Not cascaded	Not cascaded	Partially cascaded
Budget structure in use	Line-item budget	Line-item budget	Line-item budget	Line-item budget
Alignment of plans and budgets	Aligned	Misaligned	Misaligned	Misaligned
Disclosure of off budget partner envelopes	Partially disclosed	Not disclosed	Not disclosed	Not disclosed
Funds pooled or fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented
Public participation through facility boards and committees	Fully implemented	Partially implemented	Not implemented	Partially implemented
Involvement of facility managers in planning and budgeting	Partially involved	Partially involved until October 2020	Not involved	Partially involved
Priority setting criteria	Revenue maximization at facility level Development Plan goals at county level	Political demands	Political demands	Political demands
Budget reprioritization during approval	Minimal Changes	Budget is reprioritized	Budget is reprioritized	Budget is reprioritized

924

925

926 **Table 5: Total County Allocation to Health**

927

	County A	County B	County C	County D	National lowest	National Highest
County Resource Envelope	9,007,239,941	4,373,032,892	7,723,038,775	6,433,026,900	13,535,455,447	4,373,032,892
Department of health ceiling	1,871,704,460	1,646,016,256	2,535,129,951	1,276,382,684	2,344,074,357	1,646,016,256
% allocated to health	<b>20.78%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>38%</b>


928 *Source: County health department vote books*

929

930 **Figures**

931


932 **Figure 1: Conceptual Framework**



946

947

948 **Figure 2: Budget Formulation Process within Counties in Kenya**



949



950 **Figure 3: Sample county programme-based budget indicating outputs/outcomes**

951

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Programme 3: Preventive and Promotive</b>					
<b>Objective</b>	To increase access to quality promotive, preventive health care services					
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Reduced morbidity and mortality due to preventable causes</b>					
<b>Sub programmes</b>	<b>Delive ry Unit</b>	<b>Key outcomes/outputs</b>	<b>Key performan ce indicators</b>	<b>Targets</b>		
				<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>
Preventive and Promotive						
Licensing and control of undertaking						
<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Programme4: Construction and rehabilitation of health facilities.</b>					
<b>Objective</b>	<b>To promote access to health care</b>					
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Health community</b>					
<b>Sub programmes</b>	<b>Delive ry Unit</b>	<b>Key outcomes/outputs</b>	<b>Key performan ce indicators</b>	<b>Targets</b>		
				<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>
4.1 Construction and rehabilitation		Constructed and renovated health facilities	No of facilities constructed / rehabilitate d	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	20

952

953