

1 **The protection gap under a social health protection initiative in the COVID-19**
2 **pandemic: A case study from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.**

3 **Corresponding author**

4 ¹Sheraz Ahmad Khan
5 Usher Institute, Room # 3.27, Doorway-1,
6 Old Medical College, The University of Edinburgh,
7 Teviot Place, EH8 9AG, Edinburgh.
8 Email: S.A.Khan-6@sms.ed.ac.uk
9 Phone: (+92) 333 9233 757. (+44) 07466 086078
10 Degrees: MBBS, MPH, PhD candidate
11 ORCID: 0000-0001-6679-9052

12 **Co-authors**

13 ²Dr Kathrin Cresswell,
14 Usher Institute, Doorway-3,
15 Old Medical College,
16 The University of Edinburgh,
17 Teviot Place, EH8 9AG, Edinburgh.
18 Phone: (+44) 7502 154 328.
19 Fax: (+44) 131 650 9119.
20 Email: Kathrin.Cresswell@ed.ac.uk
21 Degrees: BSc, MSc, PhD
22 ORCID: 0000-0001-6634-9537

23
24 ³Prof. Aziz Sheikh
25 Usher Institute
26 Doorway-3
27 Old Medical College
28 The University of Edinburgh
29 Teviot Place, EH8 9AG, Edinburgh.
30 Phone: (+44) 131 651 4151.
31 Fax: (+44) 131 650 9119.
32 aziz.sheikh@ed.ac.uk
33 Degrees: BSc, MBBS, MSc, MD, FRCGP, FRCP, FRCPE, FFPH, FACMI, FFCI, FRSE, FMedSci
34 ORCID: 0000-0001-7022-3056

35

36 **Abstract**

37 **Background**

38 Sehat Sahulat Programme (SSP) is a Social Health Protection (SHP) initiative by the
39 Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (GoKP), covering inpatient services for 100% of the
40 province's population. In this paper, we describe SSP's role in GoKP's COVID-19
41 response and draw inferences for similar programmes in Pakistan.

42 **Methodology and methods**

43 We conceptualised SSP as an instrumental case study and collected three
44 complementary data sources. First, we studied GoKP's official documents to understand
45 SSP's benefits package. Then we undertook in-depth interviews and collected non-
46 participant observations at the SSP policy and implementation levels. We recruited
47 participants through direct (verbal and email) and indirect (invitation posters) methods.

48 Use of maximum variation sampling enabled us to understand contrasting views from
49 various stakeholders on SSP's policy dimensions (i.e., coverage and financing), tensions
50 between the policy directions (i.e., whether or not to cover COVID-19) and how policy
51 decisions were made and implemented. We collected data from March 2021 to December
52 2021. Thematic analysis was conducted with the help of Nvivo12.

53 **Findings**

54 Throughout 2020, SSP did not cover COVID-19 treatment. The insurer and GoKP officials
55 considered the pandemic a standard exclusion to insurance coverage. One SSP official

56 said: “COVID-19 is not covered and not relevant to us”. GoKP had stopped non-
57 emergency services at all hospitals. When routine services restarted, the insurer did not
58 cover COVID-19 screening tests, which were mandatory prior to hospital admission.

59 In 2021, GoKP engaged 10 private SSP hospitals for COVID-19 treatment. The SSP
60 Reserve Fund, rather than insurance pooled money, was used. The Reserve Fund was
61 originally meant to cover high-cost organ transplants. In 2021, SSP had 1,002 COVID-
62 19-related admissions, which represented 0.2% of all hospital admissions (N=544,841).

63 An advocacy group representative called the COVID-19 care under SSP “too little too
64 late”. In contrast, SSP officials suggested their insurance database and funds flow
65 mechanism could help GoKP in future health emergencies.

66 **Conclusion**

67 The commercially focused interpretation of SHP arrangements led to a protection gap in
68 the context of COVID-19. SSP and similar programmes in other provinces of Pakistan
69 should emphasise the notion of protection and not let commercial interests lead to
70 protection gaps.

71

72 **Introduction**

73 Target 3.D of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) embodied a commitment from
74 all countries to build the capacities for early warning, risk reduction and management of
75 national and global health risks. The International Health Regulations (IHR) and
76 emergency response capacities were selected as indicators to measure progress on
77 Target 3.D of the SDGs.(1) These indicators were measured through the World Health
78 Organization's (WHO) Joint External Evaluation of Preparedness (JEEP) of IHR and
79 emergency response capacities.(2)

80 WHO conducted JEEP of Pakistan's IHR and emergency response capacities in 2016.(2)
81 The COVID-19 pandemic arrived in Pakistan, while the JEEP recommendations were not
82 fully implemented.(2) The first case of COVID-19 in Pakistan was confirmed in Karachi
83 on 26 February 2020, while the first death was reported on 18 March 2020 in Mardan, a
84 district in the northern province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP).(3,4) KP was particularly hit-
85 hard and had the highest fatality rate of all the provinces.(3)

86 Many factors are likely to have contributed to the poor COVID-19 outcome in KP. For
87 example, the 2016 JEEP highlighted that there was one biosafety lab in KP but had no
88 biosafety officer.(3) Tertiary care hospitals had no communication with each other.(1) The
89 biosecurity situation was unknown, and the province did not have an inventory of
90 dangerous pathogens. Another concern for KP was the lack of plans for private-sector
91 engagement in responding to health threats.(5)

92 The Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (GoKP) has taken steps to enhance the private
93 sector's participation in health care through the Sehat Sahulat Programme (SSP).(6) SSP

94 is a Social Health Protection (SHP) initiative providing insurance coverage to 100% of the
95 province's population (around 36 million).(7,8) SSP provided inpatient care to permanent
96 residents of KP through a mix of public-private hospitals.(6)

97 By the end of 2021 (when our data collection completed), SSP had a network of 165
98 hospitals. The network had 127 (77%) private and 38 (33%) public hospitals. In 2021
99 alone, SSP recorded 544,157 hospitals admissions with 372,924 (68%) admissions into
100 private and 171,233 (32%) in public hospitals.(9) These data suggest that the private
101 sector played a significant role in serving SSP patients.

102 There was a research gap on whether SSP, especially its private sector providers, played
103 a similar role in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. This study was undertaken to
104 bridge this evidence gap by: (i) exploring SSP's response, especially its private hospitals'
105 role in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic; (ii) identifying gaps in SSP response; and
106 (iii) exploring possible options to enhance SSP's role in responding to future
107 epidemics/pandemics.

108 This paper is part of a four-paper series, where each paper is explicitly related to different
109 dimensions of the programme. In one paper (already published), we have contextualised
110 SSP in the broader context of UHC in KP.(10) In two papers, we will describe our findings
111 related to the notion of access under SSP (achievements and challenges) and the role of
112 the German Development Bank as SSP's policy entrepreneur.

113 **Methodology and methods**

114 Study design and ethics approval

115 We employed an instrumental case study design approach. We had ethics approval from
116 the University of Edinburgh (UK) and Khyber Medical University (Pakistan). We complied
117 with the ethics regulations. We had written informed consent from all participants and
118 ensured participants' autonomy, confidentiality, and right to withdraw.

119 Data sources

120 We used three complementary data collection methods. First, we reviewed governmental
121 programme documents (Appendix 1). Second, we undertook in-depth interviews with key
122 stakeholders (Appendix 2), and finally, we undertook non-participant observations at SSP
123 policy level meetings and hospital-based implementation sites (Appendix 3).

124 Sampling and recruitment

125 We acquired the documents from the SSP head office and its official website. The
126 included documents were either authored or commissioned by the KP, including Planning
127 Commission Form-1 (PC1) and the contract between GoKP and State Life Insurance
128 Corporation (SLIC). A PC1 is a detailed policy and operational document approved in
129 advance for each government programme in Pakistan. The plans envisaged in PC1s were
130 binding on the programmes they entailed.

131 We used purposive (maximum variation) sampling for conducting interviews and
132 collecting observations. The maximum variation sampling helped us to have strategic
133 (policy level) and operational (implementation) level views. We were able to compare and
134 contrast views from our respondents on SSP's policy directions during the pandemic (like
135 coverage and financing strategies) and tensions between the policy parameters (whether

136 or not to cover COVID-19). We were also able to understand how policy decisions were
137 made at the strategic level (SSP head office) and how they translated (or did not translate)
138 into action(s) at the hospitals.

139 Key stakeholders in our study included officials from GoKP, the insurance company,
140 officials of the SSP network hospitals, public advocacy groups and technical experts
141 working at international development agencies in KP. We recruited participants through
142 direct (face-to-face or written communication) and indirect invitations (by displaying
143 invitation posters in stakeholders' offices). For collecting observations, our access to the
144 meetings at the SSP head office and SSP desks in hospitals was facilitated by the SSP
145 Director.

146 Data collection

147 We collected data from March 2021 to December 2021. Informed, written consent was
148 taken from all participants. We collected data as per the interview guide and the
149 observation sheet that we had developed. The programme documents were used to follow
150 the SSP evolution in terms of the population, services and financial coverage. Through
151 the interviews with stakeholders, we explored the reasons behind the policy decisions
152 (about COVID-19 coverage), their implications like out-of-pocket (OOP) expenditure and
153 the potential ways to harness SSP's role in responding to any future pandemics. Through
154 the non-participant observations, we explored how SSP policy decisions were made and
155 how they were (or were not) translated into implementation.

156 Data analysis

157 We conducted thematic analysis of the dataset. This comprised of 20 documents
158 (Appendix 1), transcripts of 62 interviews (Appendix 2) and 17 observation sessions
159 (Appendix 3). All these data pieces were brought together in Nvivo 12, which was also
160 used to support analysis. We conducted open coding of the data. Codes with similar
161 information were brought together to form themes.

162 The Multiple Streams Theory (MST) (11) and the Health Systems Strengthening (HSS)
163 Framework (12) informed our initial coding and major themes. We refined the initial
164 theory-informed coding and themes through repeated iterations of data analysis. Analysis
165 iteratively informed our ongoing data collection. Using the underpinnings of MST, we
166 explored the problems faced in SSP implementation and its beneficiaries during the
167 COVID-19 pandemic. Under the policy stream, we explored the different policy options
168 considered or selected by SSP in the pandemic response. The HSS Framework enabled
169 us to explore how the different pillars of the health system (human resources, financing,
170 delivery) and the organisational structures (funds' flow, network hospitals, benefits
171 package) of SSP facilitated or could have facilitated each other in the pandemic response.

172 Reflexivity

173 Our personal experiences shape our views and interpretation of our observations. For
174 example, one of the investigators (SAK) was infected with COVID-19 twice, six months
175 apart. That might have influenced his views that the programme should have covered the
176 pandemic. However, he did not need hospitalisation on either occasion. Also, SAK had
177 previously worked at SSP and had a collegial rapporteur with the programme managers,
178 putting him at risk of viewing the programme positively. SAK worked closely with AS and

179 KC, who pointed out subjectivity in his work when noticed, and corrective measures were
180 taken.

181 Transferability

182 SSP is at a considerably advanced implementation stage compared to other SHP
183 schemes launched by the provincial government of Gilgit Baltistan (GB) and the Federal
184 Government of Pakistan (GOP) in other provinces. Since the GB and GOP programmes
185 are scaling up their coverage and revising their benefits package, findings from this
186 research might help them decide whether or not to cover COVID-19 or such health threats
187 in their programmes' design.

188 **Findings**

189 Our findings are arranged under six themes. First, we describe the onset of the COVID-
190 19 pandemic in Pakistan in the backdrop of the 2016 JEEP recommendations. Second,
191 we present our findings on the overall government response. Third, we describe the health
192 system's response. Fourth, we present two types of SSP responses. The initial response
193 (in 2020) was that COVID-19 was "not covered and not relevant to the programme". In
194 2021, the response had changed to cover COVID-19. Finally, we describe stakeholders'
195 views on how the pandemic might influence the future trajectory of SSP.

196 **COVID-19 in the backdrop of JEEP recommendations**

197 The COVID-19 pandemic caught Pakistan unprepared said a health systems expert. The
198 system was "inept", and many deficiencies were "exposed by the COVID-19 crises". The

199 major problems highlighted were inadequate hospital beds, ventilators and warehousing
200 facilities:

201 *"In COVID-19, an inadequate workforce...inadequate stocking of medicine*
202 *and inadequate infection control measures were exposed". [11: A health*
203 *systems expert working at a development agency]*

204 Pakistan was caught off guard, said a senior official of Pakistan's Ministry of National
205 Health Services. The official reported that when the COVID-19 pandemic struck, they were
206 working on three areas flagged in the JEEP by WHO, namely: (i) Integrated Disease
207 Surveillance and Response (IDSR), (ii) antimicrobial resistance, and (iii) disease control
208 at the entry points to the country:

209 *"We were working on three areas...we were going in the right direction but*
210 *caught midway". [28: GoKP official]*

211 The prevention, detection and case management capacities were weak, according to a
212 hospital manager. These weaknesses raised fears of catastrophic outcomes of the
213 pandemic. There were no quarantine and isolation facilities, the health staff lacked basic
214 personal protective equipment, and the limited ventilators in the province were already in
215 use for critically ill patients:

216 *"We had around about 600-700 ventilators throughout the province [for a*
217 *population of 36 million]...The situation was scary. We did not even have the*
218 *basic personal protective equipment for our COVID-19 isolation wards". [42:*
219 *Head of a public sector tertiary care hospital]*

220 Until the end of 2021, Pakistan reported 28,900 COVID-19-related deaths and a mortality
221 rate of 6.6 per 100,000 population.(13) Deaths reported in KP were 5,930, with a mortality
222 rate of 8 per 100,000 population.(13) The WHO considered these figures as grossly under-
223 reported.(14) The estimated excess deaths for Pakistan and KP were 664,000 and

224 186,000, respectively.(14) The estimated excess mortality rates were 152.6 deaths per
225 100,000 population for Pakistan and 252.8 deaths per 100,000 population for KP.(14)

226 **COVID-19 and the overall government response**

227 GOP led the COVID-19 response in consultation with the provincial governments. GOP
228 had established the National Command and Operations Centre (NCOC), which
229 articulated the entire response. A respondent in our research called NCOC, the “nerve
230 centre” of Pakistan COVID-19 response.

231 A GOP respondent noted that at the onset of COVID-19, the [ex] Prime Minister of
232 Pakistan [Imran Khan] announced a stimulus package of 1.3 trillion Pakistani Rupees
233 (PKR). The money had allocation for social protection, health care and supporting
234 businesses. The major chunk of the package provided relief to daily wage workers (PKR
235 200 billion) and low-income families (PKR 150 billion).(15,16)

236 A GOP official informed that the NCOC facilitated provincial health departments
237 establishing COVID-19 quarantine centres and isolation wards in public hospitals. The
238 cost of the COVID-19-related medical expenditures came from the fiscal stimulus
239 announced by the [ex] Prime Minister of Pakistan [Imran Khan].

240 The documentary analysis (Pakistan Economic Survey 2020-21) showed that to address
241 the shortage of medical equipment, GOP eliminated duties on the import of emergency
242 medical equipment, established an emergency contingency fund (PKR 100 billion), and
243 supported health and food supplies (PKR15 billion).(15,16) Additionally, the health sector

244 obtained approvals of PKR 10.5 billion under the State Bank’s Refinancing Facility to keep
245 hospitals [mostly private] afloat.(15,16)

246 **COVID-19 and the health system’s response**

247 The estimated hospital bed capacity in Pakistan in 2017 was 109,132, with one bed per
248 1,580 people. In 2019, Pakistan had an estimated eight doctors per 10,000 population,
249 compared to, for example, 12 in Iran and 35 in the UK.(17) Apart from human resources,
250 it was acknowledged that the health system had other challenges, including deficiencies
251 in health system data management and limited testing, tracing and quarantine services.

252 *“Challenges were...deficiencies in the routine health system data and limited*
253 *availability of the public health labs. There were limited facilities for testing,*
254 *tracing, and quarantine.” [28: GoKP official]*

255 The government’s emphasis remained on public sector hospitals. A GoKP official shared
256 two reasons for excluding the private sector from COVID-19 case management: (i) in
257 public sector hospitals, where the government was in direct control of the response; and
258 (ii) the private sector, which was kept as a reserve in case the public sector was
259 overwhelmed.

260 *“The government had established COVID wards in all the public sector*
261 *hospitals...But people still had the option to visit a private hospital if they could*
262 *afford it”. [45: Public sector hospital administrator]*

263 A private hospital’s manager however noted that not all private hospitals were allowed to
264 treat COVID-19 patients. Except for some state-of-the-art private hospitals, the private
265 sector was barred from treating COVID-19 patients. The private sector was kept as a
266 reserve, said a GoKP official. However, the advocacy groups highlighted the government’s

267 fear of a worsening pandemic and cost escalation at the loosely regulated private
268 hospitals.

269 The public sector hospitals performed at full capacity. A hospital manager said their facility
270 usually had a bed occupancy rate of 98%, which he noted was beyond the WHO
271 recommended rate of 85-90%. They reportedly had taken several measures with limited
272 resources to create a surge capacity for COVID-19 patients.

273 *“We stopped our elective admissions as well as elective surgeries, in all the*
274 *departments and got more beds available [for COVID-19 patients]” [42: Head*
275 *of a public sector tertiary care hospital]*

276 Patients also avoided hospitals, creating capacity for COVID-19 patients, shared a public
277 sector hospital’s manager:

278 *“Due to the ongoing COVID, some patients are reluctant to get admitted.*
279 *Otherwise, we have more than 80 per cent bed occupancy. [8: Manager at a*
280 *public sector tertiary hospital]*

281 The pandemic had strained the budgets of the public sector hospitals. Hospitals had
282 incurred liabilities on COVID-19 care, but a hospital manager noted that direct budgetary
283 support from GoKP had decreased. They expected to raise revenue through SSP to bridge
284 their budget gap:

285 *“Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we have created a financial liability of Rs.60*
286 *million. The direct government’s financial transfers are drying up, and we will*
287 *have to generate revenue through the insurance programme [SSP]”. [7: A*
288 *public sector tertiary care manager]*

289 But the SSP revenue was not forthcoming, as COVID-19 was not covered under the
290 programme.

291 **COVID-19 and SSP's initial response: not covered and not relevant**

292 Throughout 2020, SSP did not offer COVID-19 treatment. When asked early in 2020 if
293 SSP covered COVID-19, one officer responded, "*pandemics are not covered in insurance*
294 *programmes*". Another officer further said: "COVID-19 is not a part of this programme and
295 hence not relevant".

296 The insurer argued that epidemics and pandemics were the standard exclusion from
297 insurance contracts and the GoKP officials agreed with their stance. Therefore, the role
298 of SSP in the COVID-19 pandemic remained marginal (in 2020).

299 *"Epidemics, endemics and pandemics cannot be covered in insurance*
300 *schemes"*. [2: SSP manager at GoKP]

301 In contrast to the verbal response by SSP officials, the contract document between GoKP
302 and the insurer did not mention epidemics and pandemics under the exclusions list.
303 Another official of the GoKP noted that the discussions on coverage for COVID-19 under
304 SSP at the beginning of the pandemic were inconclusive.

305 *"There is no such effect of the corona crisis on this programme...it required*
306 *additional strategising and funds which was not possible now"*. [2: SSP
307 manager at GoKP]

308 And when asked if the insurance company would support COVID-19 treatment, a SLIC
309 official noted that only non-COVID-19 admissions were allowed.

310 *"Coverage for COVID-19 is not included in this programme, but we allowed*
311 *non-COVID admissions"*. [5: Manager at SLIC]

312 However, there were no non-COVID-19 or routine admissions. All routine hospital
313 admissions were stopped as a policy decision by GoKP. Therefore, the non-emergency
314 SSP admissions had significantly decreased:

315 *“Before the pandemic, there were 300-350 hospital admissions per day.*
316 *During the pandemic, admissions reduced to 50 per day. This trend*
317 *decreased the card utilisation”.* [2: SSP manager at GoKP]

318 Once routine services started, GoKP policy was to admit only COVID-19 negative patients.

319 A SLIC official reported that the programme did not cover COVID-19 screening tests;

320 hence patients had OOP expenditure. A SLIC manager noted the cost for [COVID-19]

321 antibody and real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) tests

322 was PKR 1,000 and PKR 7,000, respectively.

323 *“Due to the COVID-19 screening costs, the patients’ admission and surgery*
324 *rate is very low. I think state life should contribute to such pandemic situations.*
325 *In the seven thousand rupees of screening cost, state life should contribute*
326 *three or four thousand”.* [5: Manager at SLIC]

327 **COVID-19 and SSP’s later response: to cover and stay relevant**

328 As the pandemic progressed, the outlook of SSP changed, i.e., it started to finance

329 COVID-19 treatment (from February 2021). A senior GoKP official presented two reasons

330 for this change: (i) SSP utilisation rates had dropped significantly; and (ii) GoKP’s special

331 fund for COVID-19 was depleting:

332 *“The government asked us to identify the top 10 private hospitals to provide*
333 *services to COVID-19 patients under SSP”.* [1: a senior GoKP official]

334 It marked a departure from the earlier stance of the programme that “COVID-19 was not

335 covered and not relevant”. A GoKP official informed that in 2021, SSP had 1,002 COVID-

336 19-related admissions, which were 0.2 % of the total hospital admissions (N=544,841).

337 However, the official informed that the average cost for a COVID-19 patient was more

338 than thrice the average cost of a non-COVID-19 admission.

339 A GoKP official noted that the COVID-19 coverage under SSP, once started, was

340 unlimited, i.e., there was no upper limit on expenditure. SLIC officials still maintained that

341 pandemics were not an insurable risk, and the COVID-19-related hospital bills were paid
342 from the reserve fund. A GoKP official informed that the reserve fund was established for
343 high-cost procedures like kidney and liver transplants and provided additional coverage
344 for critically ill patients whose standard coverage had expired.

345 Hence to cover COVID-19, the benefits package or the premium were not revised. As per
346 the GoKP and SLIC contract, the insurer's profit depended on savings of the primary pool
347 (premium). The company worked as a third-party fund administrator for the reserve fund.
348 SLIC did not assume any profit or loss for the reserve fund.

349 Though the COVID-19 coverage did not accrue any cost to the insurer, their representative
350 did not sound positive. This may have been due to a potential increase in their workload
351 or the absence of a financial incentive for the company:

352 *"With the 100% coverage, now they are in haste in adding more and more*
353 *services...they have also included COVID-19 coverage from the reserve*
354 *fund...you cannot just replace all the parallel programmes with the insurance*
355 *scheme". [6: Manager at SLIC]*

356 In contrast with the SSP coverage, a SLIC official reported that they had extended
357 coverage for COVID-19 to their corporate clients. Corporate clients were public or private
358 sector employers who had purchased group life insurance from SLIC for their staff, and
359 their health coverages linked to their unit-linked insurance plans.

360 SSP did not play a role in the COVID-19 vaccination either. The COVID-19 vaccination
361 formally started on 3 February 2021 with a donation of 1.5 million Sinopharm doses from
362 China.(170) The global shortage of the vaccine was cited as a reason by a GoKP official
363 for delays in the vaccination rollout:

364 *“Pakistan started vaccination in February 2021. We started vaccination on a*
365 *priority basis for 60 plus population and those working in health care. As*
366 *vaccines became available, younger age groups were vaccinated”. [A senior*
367 *GoKP official]*

368 The GOP and GoKP used the public sector infrastructure for the COVID-19 vaccination
369 rollout. As more vaccines became available, GoKP considered engaging the private
370 sector. A SLIC official informed that GoKP wished to engage the private hospitals under
371 the SSP network in the vaccination rollout. Subsequently, SLIC wrote to the private
372 hospitals to arrange for administering COVID-19 vaccines. GoKP would provide the
373 vaccines, and the hospitals would administer them free of cost.

374 *“Now another intervention they introduced is involving the programme in the*
375 *COVID-19 vaccination. This is a big problem. They are putting all the eggs in*
376 *one basket”. [6: Manager at SLIC]*

377 The insurance officials considered the private sector’s response to the vaccine proposal
378 positive. Still, the government did not follow through with those plans, and the reasons
379 were not known to the SLIC manager.

380 **SSP beyond COVID-19**

381 The preceding sections reveal that COVID-19 changed policymakers’ and managers’
382 understanding of SSP’s role. The pandemic also re-emphasised the role of international
383 partnerships in developing resilient health systems and responding to global health
384 threats. A manager of the German Development Bank (KfW) suggested the pandemic
385 might change the working relationship between GoKP and its international partners,
386 especially KfW. The manager highlighted that health was dropped from the [Pak-German]
387 cooperation priority list, at the request of the Pakistani side, when Nawaz Shareef [the
388 then Prime Minister of Pakistan] met with [then] Chancellor Merkel. Highlighting the small

389 percentage of GDP allocated to health, the KfW manager opined Pakistan could not
390 handle disasters like the COVID-19 pandemic alone and needed external support.

391 *“The health sector, for the time being, is not a priority sector anymore in*
392 *Pakistan...because of the COVID pandemic...chances are that health might*
393 *be re-introduced as a priority sector in Pakistan. [16: A KfW Manager]*

394 KfW managers highlighted that the German Government had allocated some money to
395 assess the pandemic preparedness of Pakistan, and results from that study might change
396 the nature of the partnership. Moreover, the pandemic also influenced the current
397 engagement of KfW with the programme. For example, the KfW consultants working on
398 designing the outpatient department (OPD) coverage under SSP noted that the COVID-
399 19 pandemic might change their design, which they initially thought would cover chronic
400 non-communicable diseases only.

401 *“Launching an OPD component during a pandemic without covering COVID-*
402 *19 or other infectious diseases would be hard to justify”. [29: A member of the*
403 *KfW consulting team for the OPD project]*

404 An official of SSP suggested that the programme covered 100% of the province
405 population, and the utilisation trends in its data could be used to pick epidemics and
406 outbreaks. He suggested that in the long run, SSP could serve as the nerve centre for
407 future pandemics, as was the NCOC in COVID-19. A health system specialist working
408 with a development organisation did not share this optimism however because, according
409 to him, the programme lacked the technical capacity to analyse and interpret the
410 insurance utilisation data [for surveillance].

411 **Discussion**

412 Summary of the key findings

413 COVID-19 exposed the protection gaps in SSP coverage at several stages as the
414 pandemic progressed, namely: (1) SSP refused to cover COVID-19 treatment' (2) the ban
415 on routine medical care complicated the continuity of care for many SSP patients; (3)
416 once routine services restarted, SSP patients had to pay for COVID-19 testing, as SSP
417 did not cover it; (4) when the pandemic entered year 3, SSP started to cover COVID-19
418 treatment; (5) the reserve fund earmarked for other life-saving procedures was redirected
419 to COVID-19 treatment; and (6) the inconsistencies in the programme's pandemic
420 response called for rethinking and reevaluation of the protection claims and highlighted
421 the need for better pandemic financing strategies.

422 Strengths and limitations

423 Our enquiry regarding the initiation and implementation of SSP was planned when the
424 COVID-19 pandemic started. The qualitative nature of our work enabled us to add
425 questions related the programme's role in the COVID-19 response. However, we could
426 not cover the full range of GoKP's COVID-19 response. That was beyond the ambit of our
427 enquiry. Although we had interviews representatives of patient advocacy groups,
428 including a cancer support group and a disabled persons association, we did not have the
429 perspective of any COVID-19 patients. Apart from public health concerns, our study
430 design and ethics approvals did not include direct interaction with patients.

431 Interpretation in view of the broader literature

432 The COVID-19 pandemic tested the resilience of health systems and social protection
433 regimes across the globe.(18–20) In some places, it showed the advantages of having
434 Universal Health Coverage (UHC); in others, it intensified the calls for UHC, elsewhere; it

435 reversed decades of delicate work toward UHC.(18) Additionally, it further authenticated
436 the notion that UHC and GHS were inseparable and intertwined.(16)

437 GHS refers to the proactive and reactive activities to minimise vulnerability to acute public
438 health events that endanger the collective health of populations living across geographical
439 regions and international boundaries.(20) Countries with UHC and better GHS
440 preparedness managed the pandemic well. Countries missing either UHC or GHS did not
441 fair well. Others with limited UHC and GHS suffered the most.(19)

442 Pakistan's GHS Index 2021 score was 30.4 [the score range is 0-100 with 100 being
443 ideal], and the country was ranked 130 among 195 countries. The country was ranked
444 192 for its response capacities and 150 under risk subcategories.(2,5) Our study supports
445 the GHS and JEEP findings that the country lacked plans for private-sector engagements
446 in responding to health threats.(5) Pakistan did not have UHC either.(21) Lack of reporting
447 systems might be one reasons that the incidence and mortality rates in Pakistan were
448 grossly under-reported.(14)

449 Though an official described that COVID-19 was "not covered and not relevant", the very
450 nature of the crises and the programme made it relevant.(22,23) SHP had a significant
451 role at the beginning of the pandemic (2020) when the economy was in a tailspin, inflation
452 rose, and around 13 million jobs were lost.(15,16) SHP means guaranteed access for
453 people to address their health needs irrespective of their ability to pay.(24) Else, health
454 care expenditure in the face of financial downturn and lost incomes would push people
455 into poverty.(24)

456 Various social protection interventions were undertaken under Ehsas Programme,
457 including: (i) Ehsas emergency cash transfer; (ii) Ehsas Nash-O-Numa (nutrition support
458 programme);and (iii) Ehsas Langar (free food kitchens).(16) However, the role of an
459 important component, i.e. SHP, was not as evident as the Ehsas Programme. Since SSP
460 refused services to COVID-19 patients in the acute phase of the pandemic (2020), it
461 remained a remote player in the pandemic response.

462 It can be argued that SSP did not add to the health system's resilience. Resilience refers
463 to the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb,
464 accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely
465 and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential
466 basic structures and functions through risk management.(20) The role of SSP was in stark
467 contrast with similar public-funded health insurance programmes.(20,25,26)

468 For example, in the Philippines, PhilHealth offered services to COVID-19 patients.(25)
469 Initially, PhilHealth covered people under the existing benefits package, but as the
470 epidemiology and case management guidelines of COVID-19 became clearer, PhilHealth
471 introduced a dedicated COVID-19 package.(25) Both suspected and confirmed cases
472 were covered with defined tariffs.(25) The Indian public-funded Pradhan Mantri Jan
473 Arogya Yojana (PMJAY) also covered treatment for COVID-19 at both public and private
474 sector hospitals.(26) By comparison to PhilHealth and PMJAY, SSP did not do well.

475 The Social Health Insurance (SHI) programmes in Europe went much further than SSP,
476 PhilHealth or PMJAY.(27) The SHI programmes in different European countries covered
477 COVID-19-related tests, ambulatory services, inpatient care and vaccines. These

478 programmes also added innovative and agile solutions.(27) The SHI funds paid for
479 teleconsultations, participated in contact tracing, established new access pathways and
480 offered compensations to participating physicians who lost income due to disruption of
481 routine services.(27) Additionally, the SHI funds adopted different mechanisms to
482 maintain the fund's solvency yet ensured free access to health care.(27) Considering
483 these differences, SSP has a long way to get established as a true SHP or a SHI
484 programme.

485 **Implications for policy, practice and research**

486 Our work has indirectly demonstrated that the pandemic affected access to health care
487 and that SSP beneficiaries were exposed to OOP payments. We could not ascertain
488 whether the OOP expenditure made people forgo treatment. Due to the qualitative nature
489 of work, we could not answer several important questions, including: (1) how did the SSP
490 services utilisation compare during the pandemic to the pre-pandemic numbers; (2) how
491 did refusing services to COVID-19 affect the balance sheet of the insurance company;
492 and (3) did the diversion of the SSP Reserve Fund towards COVID-19 patients affect
493 other patients? We recommend that these questions should be considered for future
494 research

495 Implications for policy and practice of SSP and other SHP programmes' policymakers
496 consideration were: (I) not the name, but the policies and their pro-patient interpretation
497 make programmes SHP or otherwise, (II) while SSP in KP is considering coverage for
498 outpatient services under a fund management modality, it is worth remembering that
499 insurance firms might be more cost-savvy when working on a premium than fixed admin

500 costs, (III) as KfW develops the outpatient component of SSP, it is essential to take the
501 JEEP recommendations on board, and (IV) considering insurer's incentive to minimise
502 losses and the government's precarious position to respond to a situation like pandemics,
503 newer financing modalities like catastrophic bonds, or parametric insurance instruments
504 should be developed. Further research is recommended to operationalise these
505 recommendations, bridge the protection gaps and improve the SSP response to future
506 health threats.

507 **Conclusion**

508 GoKP started to utilise the SSP network hospitals more than a year after COVID-19 had
509 arrived in Pakistan. The initial refusal to cover COVID-19 and later coverage through the
510 SSP Reserve Fund raised several questions.

511 Initial refusal of SSP to cover COVID-19 treatment and its underlying assumptions did not
512 present a congruent rationale for two reasons. First, insurer justified the refusal of COVID-
513 19 treatment, arguing that pandemics were a standard exclusion from insurance
514 contracts. The question was whether the SSP contract was commercial or socially driven.
515 SSP officials sided with the insurer's interpretation, but the description of SHP did not suit
516 this commercial interpretation. Second, if pandemics were a standard exclusion, how
517 could the insurance industry, including SLIC, provide COVID-19 treatment to corporate
518 clients? Refusing services to the vulnerable in a pandemic under a publicly funded social
519 protection programme might not promote equity and social protection.

520 The average cost of treatment for COVID-19 was much higher than the average cost of
521 non-COVID cases under SSP. Many patients who had COVID-19 treatment before SSP

522 started to pay for it might have experienced OOP and catastrophic health expenditures.
523 On the one hand, the COVID-19-related treatment might be expensive, but on the other
524 hand, the insurer might not have acted vigorously to cut costs, as they had no incentive
525 to save the SSP Reserve Fund money. Using the SSP Reserve Fund insulated the
526 primary insurance pool (money paid as premium), which apparently kept the insurer
527 profitable.

528 **Declarations**

529 Ethics approval and consent to participate

530 We had ethics approval from the Ethics Committee at the University of Edinburgh and
531 local ethics approval from the Khyber Medical University. We have complied with the
532 ethics regulation of the approval bodies at all stages of the research and have maintained
533 a written record of informed consent for the study participants.

534 Consent for publication

535 Our work does not include any potential identifiers of our participants, and we had the
536 consent of the participants to publish our work based on their participation. We did not
537 use any copyrighted material in this paper.

538 Availability of data and materials

539 The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available from the
540 corresponding author on reasonable request.

541 Competing interests

542 We have no competing interests.

543 Funding

544 The work was made possible through a PhD funding from the Higher Education
545 Commission of Pakistan. The funder did not influence the study design, data collection,
546 analysis or reporting.

547 Authors' contributions

548 SAK developed the research plan and led the data collection, analysis and write-up. KC
549 and AS contributed to refining the study design advised on the data collection, analysis,
550 and interpretation, and helped refine the manuscript. All authors read and approved the
551 final document.

552 Acknowledgements

553 We acknowledge the SSP Director for supporting our work.

554 **References**

- 555 1. United Nations. Proposal for Sustainable Development Goals .:. Sustainable
556 Development Knowledge Platform. 2016 [cited 2015 Dec 6]; Available from:
557 <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal3>
- 558 2. World Health Organization. Joint External Evaluation of IHR Core Capacities of
559 the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Geneva, Switzerland; 2017.
- 560 3. Ilyas N, Azuine RE, Tamiz A. COVID-19 Pandemic in Pakistan. Int J Transl Med
561 Res Public Heal. 2020;4(1):37–49.
- 562 4. Ullah R, Rana MS, Qadir M, Usman M. First COVID-19 related death in Pakistan
563 in a patient with a travel history in Saudi Arabia. Asian Pac J Trop Med.
564 2020;13(8):375.
- 565 5. 2021 GHS Index Country Profile for Pakistan [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Apr 10].

- 566 Available from: <https://www.ghsindex.org/country/pakistan/>
- 567 6. Hospitals – Sehat Card Plus [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr 8]. Available from:
568 <https://sehatcardplus.gov.pk/hospitals/>
- 569 7. Social Health Protection Initiative KP. Hiring insurance company; Request for
570 proposal (RFP). Peshawar; 2020.
- 571 8. GoKP and SLIC. Agreement between the Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
572 and the State Life Insurance Corporation of Pakistan. Peshawar; 2020.
- 573 9. Claxton G, Damico A, Rae M, Young G, McDermott D, Whitmore H. Health
574 Benefits In 2020: Premiums In Employer-Sponsored Plans Grow
575 4 Percent; Employers Consider Responses To Pandemic. *Health Aff (Millwood)*.
576 2020 Nov;39(11):2018–28.
- 577 10. Khan SA, Cresswell K, Sheikh A. CONTEXTUALISING SEHAT SAHULAT
578 PROGRAMME IN THE DRIVE TOWARDS UNIVERSAL HEALTH COVERAGE
579 IN KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN. *KHYBER Med Univ J*. 2022;14(1).
- 580 11. Ricketts TC, Goldsmith LJ. Access in health services research: The battle of the
581 frameworks. *Nurs Outlook*. 2005;53(6):274–80.
- 582 12. World Health Organization. MONITORING THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF HEALTH
583 SYSTEMS : A HANDBOOK OF INDICATORS AND [Internet]. Geneva,
584 Switzerland; 2010. Available from:
585 https://www.who.int/healthinfo/systems/WHO_MBHSS_2010_full_web.pdf
- 586 13. Ministry of National Health Services Regulation and Coordination. COVID-19
587 Health Advisory Platform by Ministry of National Health Services Regulations and
588 Coordination [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Apr 10]. Available from:
589 <https://covid.gov.pk/stats/pakistan>
- 590 14. Wang H, Paulson KR, Pease SA, Watson S, Comfort H, Zheng P, et al.
591 Estimating excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic
592 analysis of COVID-19-related mortality, 2020–21. *Lancet*. 2022;399(10334):1513–
593 36.
- 594 15. Finance Division; Government of Pakistan. Pakistan Economic Survey 2020-21.
595 Islamabad; 2020.
- 596 16. Ministry of Finance. Impact of COVID-19 on Socioeconomic Situation of Pakistan.
597 Islamabad; 2021. (Pakistan Economic Survey 2020-21).
- 598 17. Haakenstad A, Irvine CMS, Knight M, Bintz C, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, et al.
599 Measuring the availability of human resources for health and its relationship to
600 universal health coverage for 204 countries and territories from 1990 to 2019: a
601 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*.

- 602 2022;399(10341):2129–54.
- 603 18. United Nations. Policy Brief : COVID-19 and Universal Health Coverage Executive
604 summary [Internet]. 2020. Available from: [https://unsdg.un.org/resources/policy-](https://unsdg.un.org/resources/policy-brief-covid-19-and-universal-health-coverage)
605 [brief-covid-19-and-universal-health-coverage](https://unsdg.un.org/resources/policy-brief-covid-19-and-universal-health-coverage)
- 606 19. Lal A, Erondy NA, Heymann DL, Gitahi G, Yates R. Fragmented health systems
607 in COVID-19: rectifying the misalignment between global health security and
608 universal health coverage. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10268):61–7.
- 609 20. World Health Organization. Building health systems resilience for universal health
610 coverage and health security during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond: WHO
611 position paper. Geneva; 25021. (WHO/UHL/PHC- SP/2021.01). Report No.:
612 Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
- 613 21. Ministry of National Health Services Regulation and Coordination. Universal
614 Health Coverage (UHC) Benefit Package of Pakistan: Essential package of health
615 services at community and primary healthcare centre level based on Disease
616 Control Priorities-Edition 3. Islamabad; 2020.
- 617 22. Asian Development Bank. Social protection [Internet]. Asian Development Bank.
618 Manila; 2001. Available from: <http://usid.org/doc/social-protection.pdf>
- 619 23. Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. PC-1: Social Health Protection Initiative for
620 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KfW assisted). Peshawar; 2013.
- 621 24. Dr. Lalit Garg Chinmay Chakraborty SMVSS. Healthcare Informatics for Fighting
622 COVID-19 and Future Epidemics [Internet]. EAI/Springer Innovations in
623 Communication and Computing. 2022. Available from:
624 <http://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-72752-9>
- 625 25. Philippine Health Insurance Corporation. Benefits Packages for Inpatient
626 Management of Management of Confirmed Coronaviris Diseases (COVID-19) and
627 Clarification of Probable Cases. The Philippines; 2022.
- 628 26. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. COVID-19 treatment under Ayushman
629 Bharat - Pradhan Mantri Jan Arogya Yojana [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Apr 30].
630 Available from: <https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1776527>
- 631 27. Schmidt AE, Merkur S, Haindl A, Gerkens S, Gandré C, Or Z, et al. Tackling the
632 COVID-19 pandemic: Initial responses in 2020 in selected social health insurance
633 countries in Europe☆. *Health Policy (New York)* [Internet]. 2021;(xxxx). Available
634 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2021.09.011>
- 635
- 636

637 **Appendix 1: List of documents included in the documentary analysis**

638 SSP policy and implementation documents

- 639 1. Planning Commission Form 1 for SSP.
- 640 2. Request for proposal (RFP) document, for hiring insurance company for 100%
- 641 population coverage [Phase 4].
- 642 3. GoKP and SLIC contracts for SSP.
- 643 4. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universal Health Coverage [Draf] Act, 2022.
- 644 5. KfW commissioned feasibility study for SSP (KfW Phase 1).
- 645 6. Inception report for the OPD component of SSP (KfW Phase 2).
- 646 7. Hiring of consultant for feasibility study for social health protection project Phase
- 647 III (digitilisation of SSP: KfW Phase 3).
- 648 8. Guiding document for the development of a roadmap towards achieving universal
- 649 coverage.
- 650 9. List of hospitals working with SSP.
- 651 10. Joint review of the SSP.
- 652 11. Baseline for communication strategy of Sehat Card Plus-KP.
- 653 12. First-Year Report on services' utilisation under the universal population coverage
- 654 conferred by the social health protection initiative (Sehat Card Plus) in Khyber
- 655 Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

656 Broader policy documents

- 657 13. Pakistan Economic Survey 2020-21.
- 658 14. National Health Accounts 2017-18.
- 659 15. Health Policy Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
- 660 16. Pakistan National Health Vision, 2025.
- 661 17. Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa: White Paper; Fiscal Year 2021-22.
- 662 18. Moving together to build a healthier Pakistan: Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In:
- 663 Sensitisation and Situation Analysis Workshop: provincial localisation of UHC
- 664 Benefit Package.
- 665 19. Burden of Disease, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In: Sensitisation and Situation Analysis
- 666 Workshop: provincial localisation of UHC Benefit Package.
- 667 20. UHC Benefit Package of Pakistan: Essential package of health services at
- 668 community and primary healthcare centre level based on Disease Control
- 669 Priorities-Edition 3.

670

671 **Appendix 2: Distribution of in-depth interviews at policy and implementation level**
 672 **stakeholders of SSP.**

Policy level interview	30
Government officials, including SSP managers at the department of health	6
Representatives of State Life Insurance Corporation	5
Hospital executives	6
Officials of international development agencies	8
Representatives of patient/public advocacy groups	5
Implementation level interviews	32
Interviews at the private sector, tertiary care hospitals	8
Interviews at the private sector, secondary care hospitals	8
Interviews at the public sector, tertiary care hospitals	8
Interviews at the public sector, secondary care hospitals	8
Total interviews (at policy and implementation level)	62

673

674 **Appendix 3: Distribution of non-participant observations at SSP policy meetings**
 675 **and implementation sites.**

Number of sessions	Observation level	Observation sites	Duration (hours)
5	Policy level	Policy level meetings at the SSP head office	15
3	Implementation level	SSP desks at private sector, tertiary care hospitals	12
3	Implementation level	SSP desks at private sector, secondary care hospitals	12
3	Implementation level	SSP desks at public sector, tertiary care hospitals	12
3	Implementation level	SSP desks at public sector, secondary care hospitals	12
17	---	---	63

676