

1 **Effectiveness of a multi-country implementation-focused network on quality of care:**  
2 **delivery of interventions and processes for improved maternal, newborn and child health**  
3 **outcomes**

4  
5 **Authors:** Nehla Djellouli<sup>1\*</sup>, Yusra Ribhi Shawar<sup>2,3</sup>, Kasonde Mwaba<sup>1</sup>, Kohenour Akter<sup>4</sup>, Gloria  
6 Seruwagi<sup>5</sup>, Asebe Amenu Tufa<sup>6</sup>, Geremew Gonfa<sup>6</sup>, Kondwani Mwandira<sup>7</sup>, QCN Evaluation Group,  
7 Agnes Kyamulabi<sup>5</sup>, Jeremy Shiffman<sup>2,3</sup>, Mike English<sup>8</sup>, Tim Colbourn<sup>1\*</sup>

8  
9 **Affiliations**

10 1 Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK

11 2 Bloomberg School of Public Health, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

12 3 Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, John Hopkins University, Washington D.C., USA

13 4 Perinatal Care Project, Diabetic Association of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh

14 5 School of Public Health, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

15 6 Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

16 7 Parent and Child Health Initiative PACHI, Lilongwe, Malawi

17 8 Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

18

19

20 **\*Corresponding authors:** Dr Nehla Djellouli, Institute for Global Health, University College London,

21 London, UK, [n.djellouli@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:n.djellouli@ucl.ac.uk) and Prof Tim Colbourn, Institute for Global Health, University

22 College London, London, UK, [t.colbourn@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:t.colbourn@ucl.ac.uk)

23

24 **Keywords:** network effectiveness, quality of care network, leadership, action, learning, accountability

25

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 26 **Abstract**

27 The Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (QCN) aims to  
28 work through learning, action, leadership and accountability. We aimed to evaluate the effectiveness  
29 of QCN in these four areas at the global level and in four QCN countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi  
30 and Uganda.

31  
32 This mixed method evaluation comprised 2-4 iterative rounds of data collection between 2019-2022,  
33 involving stakeholder interviews, hospital observations, QCN members survey, and document review.  
34 Qualitative data was analysed using a coding framework developed from underlying theories on  
35 network effectiveness, behaviour change, and QCN proposed theory of change. Survey data capturing  
36 respondents' perception of QCN was analysed with descriptive statistics.

37  
38 The QCN global level, led by the WHO secretariat, was effective in bringing together network  
39 countries' governments and global actors via providing online and in-person platforms for  
40 communication and learning. In-country, various interventions were delivered in 'learning districts',  
41 however often separately by different partners in different locations, and disrupted by the pandemic.  
42 Governance structures for quality of care were set-up, some preceding QCN, and were found to be  
43 stronger and better (though often externally) resourced at national than local levels. Awareness of  
44 operational plans and network activities was lower at local than national levels but increased from  
45 2019 to 2022. Capacity building efforts were implemented – yet often dependent on implementing  
46 partners and donors. QCN stakeholders agreed 15 core monitoring indicators though data collection  
47 was challenging, especially for indicators requiring new or parallel systems including those on  
48 experience of care. Accountability through community engagement, scorecards, and ombudsmen was  
49 encouraged but these initiatives remained nascent in 2022.

50

51 Global and national leadership elements of QCN have been most effective to date, with action,  
52 learning and accountability more challenging, partner or donor dependent, remaining to be scaled-  
53 up, and pandemic-disrupted.

54

## 55 **Introduction**

56 Improving the quality of care is an increasing focus of global health[1-3], and is high on the global  
57 maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) agenda.[4] In February 2017, the Network for Improving  
58 Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (QCN) was launched in Lilongwe, Malawi.[5]  
59 QCN brings together government ministries of health in 11 participating countries, implementing  
60 partner organisations and donors, to work with healthcare professionals to improve the quality of care  
61 for mothers, newborns and children, via work at global, national and local levels.[6, 7] QCN’s vision is  
62 “every mother and newborn receives quality care throughout pregnancy, childbirth and postnatal  
63 period” through values of “quality, equity and dignity” and its stated goal is “halving maternal and  
64 newborn deaths in health facilities in five years”. [8] To achieve this goal, QCN agreed on four strategic  
65 objectives: Leadership, Action, Learning and Accountability (LALA), used as a framework to  
66 operationalise implementation of the network activities.[8] As detailed in the QCN strategic objectives  
67 document[8], leadership entails setting up policies, strategies and structures within countries to  
68 support the systems change needed to improve quality of care. The action strategic objective is  
69 focused on accelerating action through better coordination and harmonisation of efforts to improve  
70 quality of care, using evidence-based standards and interventions, as well as putting the learning of  
71 the network into practice.[8] Learning occurs at the national and global levels around what is needed  
72 to improve quality of care and how to achieve this, sharing best practice knowledge within and  
73 between countries.[8] Transparent data collection and documentation are required for learning, and  
74 for accountability, which also involves mechanisms to ensure community engagement and  
75 accountability for good user experience of care.[8] Each strategic objective outlines 3-4 outputs that  
76 network countries are expected to achieve.[8] Countries used this framework for the planning and  
77 programming of QCN activities in-country. WHO used the outputs laid out in the LALA framework to  
78 monitor countries in terms of implementation milestones.[9]

79

80 This is the third paper in a collection evaluating the QCN [S1\_Text. PLOS GLOBAL HEALTH QCN  
81 Evaluation Collection 2-page summary]. This paper looks at delivery of interventions in QCN at the  
82 global, national and local levels, which is of key importance given QCN is an implementation-focused  
83 network. The aim of this paper is to investigate QCN effectiveness, focusing on the work of the  
84 network at global level as well as in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda – four of the 11 QCN  
85 countries we use as case studies - reflecting a range of QCN emergence, institutionalisation and  
86 embeddedness.[7, 10] In this analysis, we therefore concentrate on the effectiveness of the network  
87 in changing processes that should improve maternal, newborn and child health outcomes.

88

89 This evaluation explores QCN's effectiveness by examining its outputs, policy consequences and  
90 impact.[11] Here we conceptualise outputs of the network as QCN activities from global to local levels,  
91 including development of quality of care standards for MNCH, international and national meetings,  
92 and quality improvement (QI) interventions. Policy consequences in our analysis focus on global and  
93 national policy processes such as the development of MNCH quality of care roadmaps in each country,  
94 alignment of goals and funding between MNCH partners, and the scale-up of QI interventions in-  
95 country. As Shiffman et al. (2016) denotes, the impact of a network, particularly on improving  
96 population health is complex and difficult to determine due to a myriad of factors contributing to  
97 population health, within and beyond the efforts of the network.[11] Although the aim of the network  
98 was to reduce case fatality rates by 50% by the end of 2022, the measurement of that outcome is  
99 incomplete, and is beyond the scope of our research. Thus, we focus on intermediate processes and  
100 outputs of the network at all levels of governance. We take into consideration multiple influences  
101 within and beyond the network's activity that shape its effectiveness. We end by discussing the way  
102 in which the network's features and the policy environment shape QCN's effectiveness.

103

104 Understanding the effectiveness of QCN is important given its scale and ambition and the investments  
105 it has involved over five years (2017-2022). It is also crucial given QCN's possibility to influence the

106 way international health organisations and donors operate in the future. This evaluation provides  
107 useful knowledge for future multi-country global health networks.

108

## 109 **Methods**

110 To evaluate the work of the QCN, we conducted multiple embedded case studies[12] in four countries:  
111 Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda. This research design allowed us to investigate in more  
112 depth factors that might influence the effectiveness of the network by conducting a cross-country  
113 analysis of our case studies.[12, 13] Each case study comprised embedded units of analysis: the  
114 national, sub-national and local levels, as well as the country's interactions with the global level of the  
115 QCN. Within each unit of analysis, we further delved into and triangulated a multitude of perspectives  
116 (such as governments, implementing partners, health facility workers and other partners of the  
117 network) and data sources (detailed below) since the inception of the network in 2016 until March  
118 2022. We describe the case study settings in more detail in [S2\_Text. QCN papers common methods  
119 section].

120

121 To evaluate how the network operated, we conducted in multiple rounds: interviews with key QCN  
122 actors across different levels of the health systems; observations of QCN meetings and learning health  
123 facilities; a quantitative survey of QCN actors' awareness and perceptions of the network; and analysis  
124 of documents related to QCN operationalisation and implementation. Semi-structured interviews  
125 were conducted with QCN actors at the global, national and local levels and included participants from  
126 diverse backgrounds and affiliations: members of the Ministry of Health (MoH), implementing  
127 partners (e.g. UNICEF, USAID), health facility workers (managerial and clinical staff), technical  
128 partners, academic partners, WHO and other global partners. We sought to pay particular attention  
129 to the perspectives and goals of those carrying out the work of the network.[14, 15] In total, 248

130 interviews were conducted – including follow-up interviews of key stakeholders – over several rounds  
131 of data collection between March 2019 and March 2022, across all levels of governance in our four  
132 case study countries, and globally (see [S2\_Text] for breakdown of interviews per case study and  
133 round of data collection). To accommodate local restrictions related to the global pandemic, some of  
134 the interviews at global and national levels were conducted online or by telephone.[16] Initial topic  
135 guides were developed for global, national and local stakeholders that were then adapted to each  
136 country’s context and translated in local languages as appropriate. Topic guides were further refined  
137 for each round of data collection to validate emerging findings; follow-up on QCN progress and  
138 emerging lines of inquiry; and to be more specific for the category of stakeholders. Interviews were  
139 conducted by several members of the QCN Evaluation Group trained in qualitative methods and  
140 familiar with the local contexts and languages. Interviews were then transcribed verbatim and  
141 translated into English, if not conducted in English. Interviews were complemented by non-participant  
142 observations[17] of international QCN meetings as well as national and sub-national QCN meetings in  
143 case-study countries. QCN activities were further observed in each country via visits to two best and  
144 two least performing QCN health facilities that were selected based on maternal and newborn health  
145 outcomes and other quality of care data used in national schemes relevant for each country. Non-  
146 participant observations served several purposes, such as: anchoring the case studies in the real-world  
147 setting of the cases[12]; exploring why QCN activities are done (or not) and how those changed over  
148 time; probing for any effects and the veracity of QCN monitoring data; and triangulating the data.[17]  
149 Observations were completed over several rounds of data collection between March 2019 and March  
150 2022 (see [S2\_Text] for breakdown of observations per case study) by members of the QCN Evaluation  
151 Group trained in qualitative methods and familiar with the local setting (culture, language, context).  
152 We used templates (see [S2\_Text]) to capture key processes relevant to the focus of the network in  
153 each country during observations, as well as unstructured field notes. The focus of observation was  
154 sharpened over time enabled by iterative rounds of data analysis and reflection.  
155

156 Additionally, we adapted a psychometrically validated tool (5 domains, 40 indicators) developed for  
157 evaluating clinical networks[18] to evaluate the network at national and local levels in each case study.  
158 Over several rounds, we surveyed a variety of network members (e.g. clinicians, managers, advisors)  
159 that also included QCN actors beyond our observation sites, totalling 1525 responses across the  
160 countries and rounds of data collection (see [S2\_Text] for a breakdown per case study). Respondents  
161 had an option to fill in the survey online, via the Opinio platform, or on paper. Finally, we triangulated  
162 the data collected with a document review that included all relevant published and unpublished  
163 documents and communications relating to QCN at the global, national and district levels in the case  
164 study countries. These included strategy and management documents, operational plans, directives,  
165 formal minutes, and reports (see [S2\_Text]). We were able to access unpublished documents via WHO  
166 and Ministry of Health QCN contacts.

167  
168 All qualitative data was analysed using a common coding framework developed from several  
169 underlying theories that framed the overall QCN evaluation (see [S2\_Text]). In this paper, our analysis  
170 was guided by the QCN Theory of Change and monitoring framework[8] – the Leadership, Action,  
171 Learning and Accountability (LALA) strategic objectives of QCN – and the environment, structure,  
172 process and outcomes of the QCN.[19] All data was coded in NVivo 12, drawing on initial theory in  
173 both an inductive and deductive way.[17] Our codebook contained ‘theory’ codes related to  
174 underlying theories; each theory was outlined using codes and sub-codes that broke down the  
175 different components of the theory. The codebook was further supplemented by ‘case study’ codes  
176 to distinguish data specifically relevant to each case study. We describe in more detail how the  
177 codebook was developed, piloted and tested by researchers from the QCN Evaluation Group in  
178 [S2\_Text]. Over two years, many of our research team, including nine co-authors for this paper, were  
179 involved in coding data in the different case studies. Six of the co-authors were also actively involved  
180 in local data collection and familiar with the local context. Regular team meetings and rechecks took  
181 place during each round of coding in order to ensure inter-coder consistency and that coders remained



182 close to the theories underpinning the codebook. Team meetings were also an opportunity for coders  
183 to put forward new codes they deemed relevant to refine the ‘theory’ codes or to address gaps in  
184 ‘case study’ codes. The quantitative data was analysed independently in the first place, by conducting  
185 descriptive statistics of respondents and the percentages of respondents giving responses to each  
186 question. In [S2\_Text], we provide a more detailed explanation of the quantitative data analysis  
187 process. After analysis, the results of the survey were triangulated with the qualitative data.

## 188 **Ethics statement**

189 All interviews, observations and surveys were conducted after obtaining informed consent. Ethical  
190 approval was received from University College London Research Ethics Committee (ref: 3433/003);  
191 BADAS Ethical Review Committee (ref: BADAS-ERC/EC/19/00274), Ethiopian Public Health Institute  
192 Institutional Review Board (ref: EPHI-IRB-240-2020), National Health Sciences Research Committee  
193 in Malawi (ref: 19/03/2264) and Makerere University Institutional Review Board (ref: Protocol 869).

194

## 195 **Results**

196 The QCN is a highly complex network in its composition, functioning and activities, operating at all  
197 levels of governance. In other papers from this collection, we analysed the complexity of the network’s  
198 composition and functioning at global, national, sub-national and local levels.[7, 10, 19-21] In this  
199 paper, our analysis focuses on the effectiveness of the QCN through its various outputs and policy  
200 consequences as well as through the impact of such activities. We begin our analysis at the global level  
201 and then move to a cross-country analysis of QCN effectiveness at national and local levels in relation  
202 to the four LALA strategic aims – Leadership, Action, Learning, Accountability – envisioned by the QCN  
203 network as a whole. Table 1 summarises some of the key findings from our cross-country analysis.

204

## 205 **QCN effectiveness at the global level**

206 Network activities at the global level, through the QCN secretariat led by WHO, focused on supporting  
207 countries with the LALA framework, developing standards and indicators for quality of care, providing  
208 technical assistance to MoHs and facilitating learning between countries. The QCN secretariat steered  
209 the formulation and distribution of standards, guidelines, and technical documents for quality of care  
210 (QoC). In particular, the WHO co-developed with global QCN partners (such as UNICEF, USAID, IHI,  
211 Jhpiego, URC ASSIST) and countries: the QoC standards for maternal and newborn care in 2016 – prior  
212 to the official launch of the QCN [22], the QoC standards for children and young adolescents in 2018  
213 [23] and the QoC standards for small and sick newborns in 2020 [24]. As part of the network's  
214 monitoring strategy, the WHO co-developed 15 core quality indicators [25] in 2018, aligned with other  
215 global MNH initiatives [26-28], that were to be tracked in all QCN facilities and integrated in the  
216 countries' routine information systems to facilitate learning and accountability within and between  
217 QCN countries. Support and technical assistance were provided by the QCN secretariat to countries  
218 through regular calls, periodic implementation and technical briefs, field visits, and meetings with  
219 Ministries of Health (MoHs) to share implementation progress and challenges.

220

221 To further facilitate learning between countries, the QCN secretariat organised international meetings  
222 where all global partners and network countries sent delegations of eight to ten people, creating  
223 opportunities to evaluate progress of the network, share lessons learned and network between  
224 countries. These meetings were seen as facilitating both the Learning and Accountability facets of the  
225 LALA framework. Global and national participants noted that those meetings evolved in time as the  
226 network matured, from the global leadership and technical experts sharing information  
227 unidirectionally to national stakeholders, to countries sharing their progress and learning with one  
228 another whilst global actors took a background role. Participants also saw the international meetings  
229 as providing a necessary chance to “take stock”, evaluate, and challenge the progress of the network.  
230 Initially meant to occur annually, in practice only two international meetings have taken place: in

231 February 2017 (Lilongwe), and then March 2019 (Addis Ababa); with smaller meetings focused on  
232 technical assistance occurring in between. Because of the COVID pandemic, no further international  
233 meetings took place since 2019, with plans to hold a last meeting in March 2023 to share final lessons  
234 from countries. In addition, the QCN secretariat launched a network website, shortly after the official  
235 launch of the network in 2017, which was used as a global learning platform to share resources on  
236 QoC best practices for professionals within and outside QCN.[6] The website consists of: a knowledge  
237 library with guidance documents for QoC implementation; a podcast to share health practitioners QoC  
238 experiences; a global Community of Practice that any health practitioner can join to discuss ideas,  
239 practices and issues related to QoC for MNH; and monthly newsletters providing updates on the  
240 network's activities. Finally, the QCN secretariat facilitated regular webinars, open to anyone, on  
241 different topics and issues related to QoC where global partners present or where partner countries  
242 share updates, learning, and ideas (see [29] for more on the topic). Interviewees at the global level  
243 found this activity important to support and maintain momentum within the network. Overall, many  
244 global participants spoke of the impact of the learning emerging from the QCN, steered by the WHO  
245 secretariat, and how it should continue beyond the end of QCN as it requires little funding to maintain.  
246  
247 As demonstrated in the first paper of our collection[7], the QCN network at the global level, led by the  
248 efforts of the QCN secretariat, was effective in bringing together network countries' governments and  
249 global actors to raise the profile of QoC in MNH on the global agenda. The network at the global level  
250 was a catalyser for aligning goals between global actors and network countries, and supporting  
251 countries, leading to the emergence of the QCN network in-country.

252

253 **Table 1 Key findings on QCN network effectiveness across case study countries**

	<b>Bangladesh</b>	<b>Ethiopia</b>	<b>Malawi</b>	<b>Uganda</b>
<b>Leadership</b>				
Road map (operational	2017-2022 operational plan. 2019 Roadmap:	2017-2020 roadmap developed in	Roadmap available in 2017,	Developed 2018, revised 2020,

plan) progress and awareness	standard operating procedures (SOP) for quality improvement  58% aware of operational plan, and 82% aware of SOP at sub-national and local levels	2017, to be evaluated in 2022  34% of QCN health facility workers aware of roadmap	full developed by 2019  24% aware at sub-national and local levels	operational plan late 2019.  Low awareness at sub-national and local levels
<b>Action</b>				
Learning sites and scale-up	UNICEF: five facilities in one district then 27 facilities in 6 districts. Save the Children: a few, then 56 facilities in one district.  Scale-up to 298 facilities across 28 districts by early 2022	48 facilities across 14 districts  Scale-up: not done by early 2022	25 facilities across 6 learning districts, not selected until 2019  Scale-up: not done by early 2022	18 facilities across 6 learning districts.  Scale up: 3 additional regions covering 88 facilities
<b>Learning</b>				
Integration of 15 core quality indicators into national health information systems	Government collects 41 indicators on quality of care including most of the 15 core quality indicators.  Water and sanitation, and experience of care indicators remain unintegrated.	Parallel system to collect 15 core quality indicators, though integration planned.	Some indicators integrated in 2018.  One experience of care indicator integrated, others remain unintegrated.	Some indicators integrated in 2019.  Experience of care indicators remain unintegrated.
<b>Accountability</b>				
Establishment of a mechanism for community engagement	Existing community involvement mechanisms pre-dating QCN, e.g. involvement of community	Community elected client councils lead Community Score Card review process including health facility	Included community engagement and social accountability as part of quality of care standards.	Included community engagement and social accountability as part of quality of care standards.

leaders in monthly district leadership coordination meetings	workers and service users	Community score cards in some districts.  Establishment of ombudsmen at facilities. Though ombudsman not independent, and not often used.	Development of community dialogue guidelines for discussion of quality assessment results with communities.
--	------------------------------	---	---

---

254

255 **Leadership**

256 As described in other papers from this collection [7, 10], QCN was designed to give governments  
257 leadership of in-country implementation. The implementation approach therefore relied on MoHs to  
258 align the goals of in-country MNCH partners as well as resources to develop or strengthen national  
259 policies, strategies and structures for quality of care in [MNH] health services [8] in order to pursue  
260 the network's four strategic objectives. Thus, in-country, implementation was steered by the MoH  
261 through a technical working group (TWG) comprised of a variety of partners with the aim of  
262 developing or updating a national MNCH QoC roadmap and operational plan for the implementation  
263 of the QoC standards, as well as provide technical and financial support for QoC implementation.  
264 Funding for QoC implementation was also to be provided by MoH, according to countries' roadmaps  
265 [30-32], however government funding proved to be limited and unpredictable. In Ethiopia, thanks to  
266 their earlier work on QoC [7], by 2017 their TWG was formed and the national roadmap for 2017-  
267 2020 was developed and due to be evaluated in 2022. National key informants felt that the roadmap  
268 has clearly put goals and strategies for implementation including procedures, indicators and  
269 monitoring and evaluation. There was also regular meetings and communication among them to help  
270 cohesion. Yet, the roadmap was not well known amongst our survey participants working in QCN  
271 health facilities, as only 34% confirmed they were aware of it in Nov-Dec 2021. In Uganda, although  
272 the TWG was established in 2017, its work was relatively slow until 2019 when a champion was  
273 assigned, according to national interviewees. The roadmap was developed in 2018, then revised in

274 2020, with an operational plan devised end of 2019. Interviewees in our first round of data collection  
275 linked the lack of roadmap and direction early in the network's implementation with a lack of clarity  
276 and coordination, resulting in many actors undertaking various activities across the country without  
277 standardisation. Once implemented, our interview and survey results indicate a lack of awareness of  
278 the roadmap and operational plan among sub-national and local participants particularly, suggesting  
279 those might not be widely utilised. One reason could also be that at the frontline, these documents  
280 are presented in the form of tools or guidelines and not necessarily referred by the macro policy labels  
281 such as 'roadmap'. Additionally, interviewees have indicated that adhering to the roadmap and plan  
282 was challenging because of different factors but most especially the diversity and approaches of  
283 network partners who sometimes used additional tools, local targets or had different schedules. In  
284 Malawi, the TWG was established in 2017 and the roadmap made available in 2018. As the roadmap  
285 and other strategic documents were not ready at the launch of the network, national interviewees in  
286 earlier rounds of data collection described a lack of strategic direction leading to delays in  
287 implementation and unorganised activities. In later rounds, national interviewees found the roadmap  
288 helpful by providing direction and outlining roles and responsibilities of partners. Some national  
289 implementation partners further believed the roadmap helped harmonise the efforts of various  
290 partners and ensured resources were used more effectively. In contrast however, awareness of the  
291 roadmap was still low (24%) among our 135 survey respondents in our last round in Malawi –  
292 predominantly from the sub-national and local levels – whilst awareness of other strategic QCN  
293 documents varied between 17% and 48%. Bangladesh developed a broad operational plan for health,  
294 nutrition and population for 2017-2022 which helped, along with additional national plans and  
295 guidance on quality of care (2015), patient safety (2018), and quality improvement (2019) to establish  
296 structures for quality improvement including those used in QCN. By mid-2021, 58% of survey  
297 respondents at sub-national and national-level in Bangladesh were aware of the operational plan and  
298 82% were aware of the quality improvement standard operating procedure.  
299

300 The other component of the Leadership QCN strategic objective was the establishment of supportive  
301 governance structures in all countries to lead the QCN work within the health system. At the national  
302 level, all countries established a directorate within the MoH to oversee QI efforts, including for MNH,  
303 and hence QCN activities. Directorates were established before the inception of QCN, in Bangladesh,  
304 Ethiopia and Uganda, whilst Malawi set up theirs in 2016, ahead of the official launch of the QCN. The  
305 main functions of the national directorates are to oversee the coordination of QI activities and training  
306 in the country, establish quality standards, guidelines and standard operating procedures, and to  
307 monitor and evaluate them. Additionally, various national QI committees were established to support  
308 implementation in Bangladesh, although it has been difficult to assess their impact as few committee  
309 meetings took place over the years, according to our participants and our observations.

310

311 QCN governance was more developed at the national level of case study countries and lack of  
312 governance structures at sub-national and local levels impaired effectiveness of QCN activities. Where  
313 governance structures existed at sub-national or local levels their effectiveness was often impeded by  
314 a lack of capacity, lack of human resources or lack of ownership of responsibilities, and lack of support  
315 from national level.

316 *“Regional quality structure is very weak and it is understaffed. Even those assigned people*  
317 *have lots of responsibilities. They are assigned for every quality-related activity, not just for*  
318 *MNH - not only that - but also do other things and it is difficult”*

319 (Implementing partner-National-Ethiopia Round 2)

320

321 Corruption was also mentioned as an issue, particularly in Uganda and Ethiopia. For example, in  
322 Uganda some key informants mentioned both cases of individuals diverting funds and systemic issues  
323 related to procurement of supplies and favouritism in relation to travel, training and mentorship  
324 opportunities.

325

326 Leadership at national level has been important to coordinate and monitor QI efforts in the countries.  
327 Funding for those functions however has been dependent on international donors, which impacted  
328 the QCN implementation in-country and raises issues for the sustainability of leadership efforts. Even  
329 in countries where network emergence was stronger [7] due to existing policies and initiatives and  
330 where leadership and QoC were more institutionalised, effectiveness of the network was still  
331 dependent on financial resources that are mostly external and on the commitment of governments  
332 to dedicate resources to QoC. In Ethiopia, the government has a budget allocated for quality  
333 improvement and QCN was part of it. This budget was small, especially after funds were diverted due  
334 to the COVID-19 pandemic and to rehabilitate conflict-affected areas. Implementing partners  
335 supported the 48 facilities by supporting coaching and learning activities and supporting the MoH to  
336 prepare TWG and annual QCN meetings. In Bangladesh, efforts have been made to secure their own  
337 independent budget but that has not been achieved yet according to government participants.

338

### 339 **Action**

340 The 8 WHO QoC domains and linked standards for maternal and newborn care [22] were adapted in  
341 2017 in Ethiopia and Uganda, in 2018 in Bangladesh, and in 2019 in Malawi, with technical assistance  
342 from other QCN partners. Before this, there were no national QoC standards for MNH in Malawi,  
343 Uganda and Ethiopia, though quality of care was incorporated in national plans, while some facilities  
344 in Bangladesh had been using the Every Mother Every Newborn standards [33] since 2016. In all  
345 countries, the standards were used as a QI reference tool and to assess or audit health facilities, and  
346 in some countries, e.g. Uganda, different partners were focused on different standards. Many  
347 respondents thought the standards were useful to identify where improvements were needed, for  
348 example in Malawi:

349 *“the assessment and the standards are highlighting gaps in the system”*

350 (Government-National-Malawi Round2)

351 Others thought more detail was required to improve quality of care, for example, in Bangladesh:



352            *“the QED [QCN] indicators are very generic indicators to me. It never reflects the quality*  
353            *improvement of a health facility. It should have more sub indicators.”*

354            (Implementing Partner-National-Bangladesh Round 4)

355    Adaptation in Malawi and Uganda further included the addition of a ninth standard focusing on  
356    community engagement and social accountability in order to enhance community participation in  
357    improving QoC [30, 31]. Interviewees at the national level pointed out that this additional standard  
358    was a necessary change for the success of the QCN. Regarding the other WHO standards developed  
359    by the QCN at the global level – those for children and young adolescents [23], and for small and sick  
360    newborns [24] – our data indicate that none of the countries have started to adopt them.

361

362    Under QCN’s Action strategic objective, each country was to choose learning districts and health  
363    facilities, representatives of others in the country “to serve as laboratories for learning” for  
364    implementing QoC activities.[9] By keeping track of those activities and documenting the learning, it  
365    was expected that successful interventions would be scaled-up to other districts and facilities.  
366    Learning sites were selected in each country (Table 1) by the government, together with implementing  
367    partners, some of whom had pre-existing work in the selected districts. Selection of learning sites was  
368    based on maternal and neonatal death burden, geography, and pre-existing and planned work. In  
369    Ethiopia, the government allocated specific funding for QoC in those QCN facilities in addition to  
370    funding provided by implementing partners. Several regions were excluded due to security concerns  
371    given the political instability in Ethiopia at the time of selection. Scale-up was not achieved in Ethiopia  
372    or Malawi by 2022, whereas in Uganda, and especially Bangladesh some scale-up was achieved (Table  
373    1). Implementing partners operated with a high level of autonomy and independence in terms of what  
374    activities to implement and how. Whilst the MoH tried to coordinate and track efforts, participants  
375    reported it not to be effective beyond “big” partners such as USAID. In Uganda, in 2019, the MoH  
376    worked to improve coordination and strategic implementation by moving the ownership to a different  
377    department. Interviewees reported that, beyond the learning sites, implementing partners have been

378 carrying out QCN activities in other districts they operate in. They further noted that this initial siloed  
379 and disjointed implementation attempt slowed down the success of the network in Uganda and that  
380 it was only three years into the five-year effort that a true network was beginning to form in the  
381 country. Although frontline health workers in Uganda were more aware of quality improvement  
382 efforts in general, led by the MoH and implementing partners, rather than QCN specifically. In  
383 Bangladesh, selection of sites differed as two initial pilot districts were selected in 2017 and  
384 implementation responsibilities were split between two partners: UNICEF and Save the Children  
385 (funded by USAID), who chose their own pilot learning facilities, either based on high mortality rate  
386 and remoteness or on lack of previous QI initiatives.

387


388 Whilst capitalising on existing work from partners to implement QoC interventions in QCN sites, this  
389 approach resulted in siloed working at sub-national and local levels. QCN activities in learning sites  
390 often differed in their content and scope between learning sites – depending on the implementing  
391 partners’ presence in the district – and their implementation was dependent on the available partners’  
392 resources and technical support, as financial support to learning sites from the government was  
393 limited or non-existent.

394 *“But I find the issue to do with financing more of a cause for us to fail. This is because I*  
395 *look at all the components of the health system and I find... well... I was trying at this*  
396 *particular time to think about the investments that have happened for example in [Case*  
397 *1-low performing], as a learning district. How much did government commit to the goal*  
398 *that we reduce the maternal mortality rate by 50% in the implementing [of QCN] in the*  
399 *nation and districts by 2022? If we are to be honest, success of every implementing district*  
400 *was dependant on the kind of and the flexibility of partners that are in the district”*

401 (Implementing partner-National-Malawi Round 3)

402


403 This was further noticed in our health facility observations, where these fluctuations presented a  
 404 challenge to track what QoC activities on site were considered QCN outputs. In case study QCN sites  
 405 in Bangladesh, QI activities were more easily identifiable as they were part of the determined bundle  
 406 of interventions implemented by either Save the Children’s or UNICEF’s projects (depending on the  
 407 case study). In most case study QCN sites in Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda, it proved more difficult as  
 408 many health facility workers were not aware of QCN (Figure 1) or were not able to attribute if a QoC  
 409 activity was a QCN output. Generally, the type of QCN activities observed in case study sites included:  
 410 review of routinely collected data, assessment of facilities against QoC standards, Maternal and  
 411 Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response, community engagement, point of care QI across all of  
 412 MNH continuum of care. Whilst many respondents at local levels were not aware of QCN, they were  
 413 aware of quality improvement efforts more broadly, including those pre-dating QCN.  
 414



415  
 416 **Figure 1 Network Awareness (survey data)**

417  
 418 Overall engagement with QCN was perceived to be higher (and rising) in Uganda, and Bangladesh  
 419 (though falling) than in Malawi or Ethiopia (Figure 2). In Bangladesh a median of 10-20 hours over 6

420 months was reported to have been spent directly on network activities, in Malawi 5-10 hours, Ethiopia  
 421 5-10 hours, and in Uganda 5-10 hours rising to 20-30 hours per 6 months (Figure 2). A greater  
 422 proportion of respondents in Bangladesh and Uganda also reported that their views and ideas  
 423 contributed to the network and that they were able to drive the network agenda (Figure 2).  
 424



425  
 426 **Figure 2 Network engagement (survey data)**

427  
 428 As per the LALA framework, network outputs at sub-national and local levels further involved a  
 429 capacity building element for QI interventions and monitoring QoC such as QoC training, on-site QI  
 430 coaches and QI committees within the health facilities. Capacity building and coaching visits covered  
 431 a wide range of topics, such as intervention packages, data collection and monitoring, as well as  
 432 training QI committees in developing, implementing and monitoring QoC activities. QI committees  
 433 were the QCN output most discussed in interviews and observed in case study sites, corroborated by  
 434 our survey respondents at health facility level whose majority indicated they were part of a QCN/QI  
 435 committee. Indeed, the QCN led to the establishment or development of various QI committees in  
 436 health facilities in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Uganda and Malawi. Including mostly frontline healthcare

437 workers, those committees met regularly (except during COVID-19 disruptions) to identify and  
438 prioritise QoC issues in the facility. The resulting local improvement projects were partially successful  
439 in some locations (e.g. reducing the incidence of birth asphyxia in a facility in Malawi), sometimes via  
440 logistical and funding support of implementing partners (this was mentioned in all countries), and  
441 unsuccessful in other locations (e.g. not reducing neonatal deaths in a hospital in Malawi).

442

443 In Bangladesh, Malawi and Uganda, capacity building outputs were mainly conducted by  
444 implementing partners (with collaboration on some occasions with local academic partners in  
445 Bangladesh). In Uganda some respondents thought not optimizing having Makerere University School  
446 of Public Health as the research and learning partner was a missed opportunity. In Ethiopia, despite  
447 being government-led, capacity building was supported financially and technically by implementing  
448 and technical partners. Therefore, consistency of capacity building activities throughout the  
449 implementation period was dependent on partners' presence and resources for learning sites, leading  
450 to variable levels of activity between sites.

451 *"It's much more related to financial muscles and if the committee had a proper funding to*  
452 *run its activities, like its plans to do its supervision at whatever time they should be able*  
453 *do their activity. Unlike now where they have to wait for partners to come in and help. [...]*  
454 *So, if there was a proper financial support it would be good to the network"*

455 (Government-Local Case 3-Malawi Round 1)

456

457 Learning sites activities, and their scale-up, were dependent on the presence and resources of one or  
458 several implementing partners, meaning that the amount and duration of resources provided by the  
459 implementing partner(s) dictated the level of effectiveness of the network at sub-national and local  
460 levels.

461 *"When you bring a five-year learning project, it should have its own resources for*  
462 *implementation and to scale it up with the lessons learnt. This is the reason why the*

463 *footsteps of the partners were followed. It doesn't have its own resource. Partners have*  
464 *their own interests; they all have different approaches that they follow. For example, we*  
465 *say learning collaborative should be prepared in three months. Some do it within six*  
466 *months. Some conduct coaching every month, the others do it quarterly. Therefore, it lacks*  
467 *uniformity. This is still because there is no resource. So, partners plan with their own*  
468 *resources. Due to these problems, I can't say that things have gone the way we want them*  
469 *to.” (Government-National-Ethiopia-Round 1)*

470

471 For instance, in Bangladesh, committed partners for the duration of QCN implementation, like Save  
472 the Children and UNICEF, meant that a constant level of activity was maintained in the QCN facilities  
473 they operated in with some change to show for. They were, however, themselves funded by global  
474 partners and therefore also dependent on volatile external funding. For example, when UNICEF  
475 funding was reduced in some districts this meant that QCN activities carried out by UNICEF staff had  
476 to be taken over by health facility workers leading to a drop in QCN activities. On the other hand, some  
477 learning sites (e.g. in Malawi and Uganda) had no or little partners involved, leading to a dearth of  
478 QCN activities in those sites. For example, as reported by a local stakeholder in Malawi:

479 *“...we have so many projects that we will put on paper and the issues of training QIST members*  
480 *so that they should function properly, we should know their roles and responsibilities. Now, we*  
481 *would have loved if we had a potential funder or sponsor of this program so that at least we*  
482 *know that when we have activities, these are the ones that are going to support us. But as it*  
483 *is now, there is no donor who has come openly to say that we are going to support this*  
484 *program. So, it's a challenge to us”*

485 (Government-Local Case 3-Malawi Round1).

486

487 In Uganda, there was some attempt to pool resources from partners, but this effort failed because of  
488 lack of trust, and a lack of harmonisation of different tools and methods used by different partners –

489 both exacerbated by the leadership vacuum at the start of QCN in Uganda which later improved.  
490 Additionally, as observed in several facilities, this has meant that when partners’ projects came to an  
491 end in a given area due to financial constraints or end of funding, partners ceased to support the  
492 learning sites – making it difficult for sites to continue QCN activities given their lack of human,  
493 technical and material resources, as well as undermining M&E efforts.

494 *“When IHI, WHO, CHAI pulled-out from the network, it was very difficult to cover the sites*  
495 *which were under their organizations. Taking lessons from this, we are working to make the*  
496 *government takeover the activities. There were gaps at collection of common core indicators*  
497 *when the partners pull-out. Partners always depend on the donors as a result there are*  
498 *challenges.”* (Government-National-Ethiopia Round 2).

499

500 The COVID-19 pandemic further contributed to weakening partners’ support to activities in learning  
501 sites.[21] Issues around resources dedicated to QCN are taking place in a context of weak health  
502 system capacity, in terms of material and human resources, undermining network effectiveness in all  
503 countries. This was the challenge to QCN activities most reported by participants in all countries. The  
504 lack of human (including support staff) and material resources was also observed in our case studies  
505 facilities as a hindering factor of implementation.

506 *“Looking at the 8 standards for MNCH that we adopted, we realize that implementing*  
507 *those standards isn’t just about quality improvement. We need real inputs and we have*  
508 *seen that without improving infrastructure, without having some of the services or the*  
509 *equipment, for example the newborn care to improve it, we need to have actual*  
510 *equipment, actual services, people need to have skills for managing those newborns. Some*  
511 *of the inputs were not well catered for even in the 6 learning districts and probably that’s*  
512 *why we did not see any reduction in the newborn mortality. So, we have seen that the*  
513 *input level as we implement it, the inputs that we plug into probably were not well*  
514 *addressed. Even just the technical skills not just the quality improvement skills but the*

515 *technical skills for providing services needed to be strengthened from time to time and*  
516 *needed to be in contact with the people implementing them to be supported at least on a*  
517 *quarterly basis. This did not happen for most of the districts, and so we know why we did*  
518 *not perform well.” (Government-National-Uganda Round 2)*

519

## 520 **Learning & Accountability**

521 Learning and Accountability are two important strategic objectives of the QCN. Here we discuss the  
522 infrastructures put in place in the four countries to support learning and accountability. We analysed  
523 elsewhere the diffusion of information, innovation and learning processes within the network.[29]  
524 Part of this strategy, as mentioned earlier, was the development in 2018 by WHO, global partners and  
525 network countries of 15 core quality indicators for MNH – an immense effort when considering the  
526 situation before QCN. Among global interviewees, there was general agreement that the dedicated  
527 working group had done good work and the indicators were well-received, yet by 2019 participants  
528 still described a lack of clarity on how and when data should be collected. The aim was to integrate  
529 those core quality indicators to the countries’ routine Health Information Systems (HIS), which  
530 required according to some global and national interviewees, a lot of technical support from the  
531 network secretariat (with limited manpower) and partners. Despite the complexity of the process,  
532 each country has had some success in integrating the 15 core quality indicators into their national  
533 health information systems (Table 1), though experience of care indicators have been a challenge,  
534 with independent regular systems of data collection from patients proving difficult. Data in learning  
535 sites were often collected by implementing partners. In Bangladesh, both the government and the  
536 major implementing partners aimed to place quality improvement indicators on the web-based  
537 national dashboard, which can be used to download custom reports on various indicators. National  
538 interviewees indicated that this dashboard was largely functional, and stakeholders expressed pride  
539 in their ability to roll out this new initiative while simultaneously responding to COVID-19. In Ethiopia  
540 on the other hand, the network relied on a parallel system to their HIS to collect data on the QCN




541 quality indicators (data from facilities reported up in the system electronically via spreadsheets  
542 provided by MoH) until a planned integration to DHIS2 at the next HIS revision. This proved to be a  
543 challenge according to our interviewees who reported that the QCN indicators did not align with the  
544 previous reporting system and questioned the robustness of the experience of care indicators since  
545 the data was not collected by independent actors not involved in the care provided. However, all  
546 countries faced structural issues and a lack of capacity in collecting good quality data. For instance,  
547 countries still relied on separate surveys to collect data on experience of care indicators, unlike  
548 indicators on provision of care that were captured by DHIS2 or a parallel system (for Ethiopia).  
549 Additionally, in all countries, capacity building on data collection, analysis, quality and management  
550 was crucial due to the lack of capacity at sub-national and local levels but depended on the efforts of  
551 the partners supporting the learning facility. Supported by our facility observations, several  
552 participants in all countries further brought up concerns over the reliability of the data reported,  
553 particularly around patient experiences and mortality figures. The work of the QCN on indicators and  
554 monitoring did bring attention to the importance of health data for QoC improvements. In Ethiopia  
555 for example, national and local interviewees considered that the network had improved health data  
556 documentation, management, use and reporting in health facilities, even if gaps in capacity remain.  
557 In our survey, most respondents in Bangladesh (83% rising to 88%) and Uganda (74% rising to 80%)  
558 indicated that there were quality improvement indicator dashboards or visualisations at their facility  
559 (Figure 1). This was 63% in Ethiopia and just over 50% in Malawi. Locally, in our observations in health  
560 facilities, behaviour change around data monitoring seemed to vary. Some of the sites had a system  
561 of bulletin boards which visually displayed QI metrics for the preceding several months, including  
562 maternal and neonatal mortality, as a means of making the information more accessible and of  
563 motivating staff. Some facilities, for example those observed in Bangladesh, also regularly completed  
564 partographs to monitor the progress of labour as part of efforts to reduce mortality. In some facilities,  
565 data was also discussed in the facility QI committee to improve accuracy and enhance accountability.  
566 A few facilities were observed to not be using dashboards, visualising data or using monitoring

567 indicators in their practice. At the end of our data collection, there was still a lot of work to achieve in  
568 all countries to collect (reliable) data, integrate to DHIS2, increase the quality of the data collected  
569 and improve analysis at the national level. However, from our interviews and observations, the lack  
570 of human resources and capacity around M&E makes this difficult to achieve.

571 *“Yes... I think we have not done well in the M&E. I think there is a lot that we would have*  
572 *done. Maybe the problem is that some of the problems are beyond us, because we need full*  
573 *time M&E, looking at the data and ensuring that reports are being done. And when reports*  
574 *are put in the system, analysing the information or extracting the information from whatever*  
575 *platform is there and pushing it back to policy makers and the facilities, so that they can use*  
576 *that information to further improve the network. So, there is a lot that needs to be done in*  
577 *the M&E side” (Government-National-Malawi Round 2)*

578  
579 As a result, the data received from countries was often incomplete or of poor quality leading to a lack  
580 of quantitative analysis on how well the network has done on key process and outcome indicators and  
581 whether the overall goal of the network of reducing case fatalities by 50% has been achieved.  
582 Therefore, the impact of the network on reducing mortality remains unknown, though may be  
583 reported in 2023 (WHO-Global Interviews-Round 2). For global interviewees, this goal was always  
584 *‘ambitious’ or ‘aspirational’* and they were cautious about the network’s ability to achieve it within  
585 the five-year timeframe. Among global actors there was an overall sense that the network needed  
586 these bold, ambitious targets in order to gain momentum and attract engagement, funding, and global  
587 attention. Most global actors believed these goals were an essential catalyst at the start of the  
588 network and continued to serve as important motivation. Some national and local participants in  
589 Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda believed that some progress had been achieved towards  
590 reducing maternal and/or neonatal deaths in some of the learning sites. Our survey results indicated  
591 that most respondents in each country perceived the network to be valuable, though more so in  
592 Uganda and Bangladesh than in Ethiopia or Malawi (Figure 3). Figure 3 also shows a breakdown of

593 indicators within this domain, with the highest scores being for “would recommend joining the  
 594 network”, and the network “helps me professionally”, and lower scores for perceiving QCN to have  
 595 resulted in healthcare improvements.  
 596



597  
 598 **Figure 3 Network Perceived as Valuable (survey data)**

599  
 600 As part of the Learning and Accountability strategy, countries were also to involve a research  
 601 institution to document the lessons learned from the network in order to facilitate the scale-up of the  
 602 learning to non-learning sites. In Bangladesh and Uganda, the MoH built upon existing partnerships  
 603 with academic partners such as NIPSOM and Makerere University School of Public Health respectively  
 604 to achieve this milestone. In Uganda, Makerere was not optimally engaged as the learning partner,  
 605 working instead in more of a consulting and advisory role for the MoH and WHO, with limited funding,  
 606 and did not get to interact widely and in-depth with network members. At the end of our data  
 607 collection, this milestone had not been achieved in Malawi and Ethiopia. From our qualitative data,  
 608 despite the learning achieved in-country across different platforms [29], the network was not mature  
 609 enough in any country to facilitate the scale-up of the learning from laboratories to non-QCN facilities

610 through the national research institution in a systematic way. This was due to a combination of factors  
611 including lack of funding, an over-reliance on implementing partners and delays due to the COVID-19  
612 pandemic. In Bangladesh, at the time of our last data collection in 2022, NIPSOM had advanced plans  
613 to scale-up QoC training in all districts, via allocated funding from the government budget.

614

615 Lastly, the Learning and Accountability strategy involved the establishment of a mechanism for  
616 community engagement in QoC in the learning sites, in line with the second global goal of the QCN to  
617 improve experiences of care for women and their families. Each country took a different approach to  
618 include community voices in the learning sites to improve QoC and accountability (Table 1). Some of  
619 these built on earlier work with communities pre-dating QCN, though were not always fully integrated  
620 with QCN [34]. Some community discussions and engagement mechanisms were developed into  
621 action plans with learning facilities, although in practice our data indicate that those are not fully  
622 optimised. All in all, the global QCN goal to improve experiences of care and *“enable measurable  
623 improvements in user satisfaction with the care received”* [8] seem to have been relatively neglected  
624 in national QCN implementation in all countries. Mirroring this at the global level, documents collected  
625 show an emphasis on community engagement in the early phases of QCN development (especially  
626 pre-launch) but overtime, little or no mention of this component is made. Malawi achieved the most  
627 regarding this goal. Indeed, Malawi was the only country that integrated one indicator (percentage of  
628 facilities with functional ombudsman and suggestion box or other feedback mechanism) to DHIS2  
629 linked to patient experience of care. Malawi’s establishment of an ombudsman structure was  
630 criticised though for not being independent and consequently rarely used.

631

632

### 633 **Effect of COVID-19, and political instability**

634 The COVID-19 pandemic impacted network effectiveness related to the Action, Learning and  
635 Accountability strategic objectives as those were not as advanced as the Leadership one by the time

636 the pandemic hit. Indeed, many participants at all levels of governance mentioned that QCN resources  
637 were diverted towards Covid-19; some learning facilities were repurposed to only accommodate  
638 Covid-19 patients; focus remained on Infection Prevention Control over all other aspects of QoC; and  
639 local restrictions kept patients away. Consequently, participants believed this led to important delays  
640 in implementation of interventions and scale-up as well as learning and accountability outputs. Local  
641 respondents in all four of our case study countries further indicated that all QCN activities in their  
642 facility ceased during periods of heightened restrictions. Additionally, all QCN meetings, trainings and  
643 interactions at different levels of governance reduced in frequency, even when an online option was  
644 available. Some of the frontline workers interviewed further believed that progress towards reducing  
645 case fatalities rates was stalled as a result of the pandemic. Additionally, some of the countries faced  
646 periods of instability around elections (e.g. Malawi and Uganda) and conflicts (e.g. Ethiopia) that  
647 impacted the work of the network.[21]

648

649

## 650 **Discussion**

651 Overall, we found the ‘leadership’ strategic objective of QCN to be most advanced, particularly at  
652 global and national levels, though efforts to improve co-ordination, integrate and harmonise work are  
653 on-going. QCN built on long-standing commitments and initiatives to improve maternal, newborn and  
654 child health and much progress has been made toward the ‘action’ and ‘learning and accountability’  
655 strategic objectives of QCN over the 2017–2022 period. Many gaps remain though, including those  
656 related to capacity building and mentorship, community engagement, and collection, quality and use  
657 of data on experiences of care. National scale-up has not yet happened in any of our case study  
658 countries, though may do in Bangladesh soon. The gradual pace of QCN implementation was due to a  
659 combination of factors including an over-reliance on implementing partners and donors, lack of  
660 earmarked government funding, and the COVID-19 pandemic. As several of our global level

661 respondents also suggested, it may be that an initiative like QCN requires several more years to  
662 become fully embedded in government health systems and fully operational to the point where  
663 significant impacts on maternal, newborn and child case fatality rates may be achieved (and  
664 measurable). The level of coordination, collaboration and complexity involved requires time to work  
665 through and long-term budgets, as illustrated by the guidance on district implementation developed  
666 by QCN only being published in September 2022 [35], after the end of our data collection.

667

668 Leadership of the network in each country by the MoH is a strength of QCN and a positive step toward  
669 achievement of QCN strategic objectives. It reflects national commitments to improve quality of care,  
670 following earlier focus on increasing coverage of services [S3\_Text. QCN papers common country  
671 context]. The 11 ‘pathfinder’ countries of QCN were selected based on national buy-in to the quality-  
672 of-care agenda. Strong leadership and buy-in may not have happened without the support of global  
673 partners though. Dependence on implementing partners and donors often meant MoHs had a lack of  
674 real control or ability to integrate, harmonise and scale-up the separate, complex, and often pre-  
675 existing, implementation efforts QCN started in different sub-national or local areas in each  
676 country.[10] This was also compounded by a lack of organisational and policy capacity, especially in  
677 Malawi, and external shocks such as the COVID-19 pandemic in all countries, and the conflict in  
678 Ethiopia.[21] We found the emergence of QCN to be greatest in Bangladesh [7] and this is reflected  
679 in Bangladesh being closest to national scale-up in this paper.

680

681 A systematic review of clinical networks published in 2016 and only identifying studies from high-  
682 income countries for inclusion [36] found quantitative evidence of effectiveness to be lacking. The  
683 qualitative studies summarised in this review found that networks with a positive impact on quality of  
684 care and patient outcomes had sufficient resources, effective communication and collaboration,  
685 efficient management, and credible leadership [36]. Our work corroborates these findings, and in this  
686 paper, and our papers on QCN emergence [7] and legitimacy [10], we provide an in-depth analysis

687 specific to QCN. The point on resources available for QCN activities is pertinent and comes into focus  
688 when considering that the amounts made available domestically were less than those from external  
689 partners (i.e., many activities were contingent on donor funding), and the external partner  
690 contributions were small per country per year in comparison to total spending on maternal, newborn  
691 and child health. Networks are also more likely to be effective if there is involvement of local actors  
692 in decision-making [11] and there are pre-existing relationships between actors – which was the case  
693 here. But a varied and inclusive composition of the network did not necessarily translate into network  
694 cohesion. The local peripheral levels of the network in each country were often insufficiently involved,  
695 such that the network was found to be far stronger and tangible at national and global levels than at  
696 local level.[10] In our accompanying stakeholder network analysis, we also found few local-to-local  
697 level links between QCN members in each of our case study countries – QCN was manifest as a ‘hub  
698 and spoke’ network in each country, with a low density of connections between actors, rather than a  
699 mature highly-linked network.[20] Our analysis of the sustainability of QCN [34] found that, due to  
700 lack of resources and time to embed innovations at local levels, QCN may not be sustained in its  
701 original form. Efforts to institutionalize QCN innovations in existing systems could mean aspects of  
702 QCN are carried forward within broader government quality improvement initiatives though [34].

703

704 It was widely agreed that the 2017-2022 timeframe of QCN was relatively short, and the ambitious  
705 “50% case fatality rate reduction” goal was more of a rallying cry than something QCN stakeholders  
706 thought feasible to achieve (and measure) in just five years. Given this, even though much remains to  
707 be done, what QCN has achieved so far, especially given the disruptions of the pandemic, can be  
708 considered a success.

709

710 The key strengths of our work are the iterative nature of our inquiry over multiple rounds of data  
711 collection, in four countries and at the global level of QCN, over a three year period (2019–2022), and  
712 our use of multiple methods of data collection (interviews, observations, survey, document review),

713 involving a diverse variety of QCN stakeholders, and our subsequent integrated analytical synthesis of  
714 our data, with reference to other studies we have undertaken concurrently as part of our wider QCN  
715 evaluation [S1\_Text. PLOS GLOBAL HEALTH QCN Evaluation Collection 2-page summary]. Prior work  
716 of this kind has focused on advocacy and agenda-setting networks. Our work is also unique in focusing  
717 on an implementation network. The main limitations of our research are not interviewing or surveying  
718 service users, and not being able to quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of QCN. Both were  
719 beyond the scope of our research due to limits on our funding and time, and lack of availability of  
720 required QCN quantitative data.

721

## 722 **Conclusion**

723 QCN built on varied but visible foundations to further align efforts by ministries of health,  
724 implementing partners and donors, to tackle health facility-based maternal, neonatal and child  
725 mortality and morbidity. It has had some success so far though there are many steps still to take to  
726 embed, improve, integrate, scale-up and sustain the nascent work started in health facilities in QCN  
727 countries. Continued ambition, commitment, and long-term, ideally domesticated, funding is required  
728 to continue the journey QCN has started.

729

730

## 731 **Acknowledgments**

732 We thank all respondents and stakeholders for their time and contributions toward making this work  
733 possible. The QCN Evaluation Group is: Nehla Djellouli, Kasonde Mwaba, Callie Daniels-Howell, Tim  
734 Colbourn (UCL Institute for Global Health, UK), Kohenour Akter, Fatama Khatun, Mithun Sarker, Abdul  
735 Kuddus, Kishwar Azad (BADAS-PCP Bangladesh), Kondwani Mwandira, Albert Dube, Gladson Monjeza,  
736 Rachel Magaletta, Zabvuta Moffolo, Charles Makwenda (Parent and Child Health Initiative, Malawi),  
737 Mary Kinney, Fidele Mukinda (independent researchers, South Africa), Mike English (Oxford



738 University), Yusra Shawar, Will Payne, Jeremy Shiffman (Johns Hopkins University, USA), Kathy  
739 Lubowa, Agnes Kyamulabi, Hilda Namakula, Gloria Seruwagi (Makerere University, Uganda), Anene  
740 Tesfa, Asebe Amenu, Theodros Getachew, Geremew Gonfa (Ethiopia Public Health Institute, Ethiopia),  
741 Seble Abreham, Tanya Marchant (LSHTM, UK)

742

743

## 744 **Figure captions**

745 **Fig1. Network Awareness (survey data)**

746 **Fig2. Network engagement (survey data)**

747 **Fig3. Network Perceived as Valuable (survey data)**

748

## 749 **Supporting Information**

750 **S1\_Text. PLOS GLOBAL HEALTH QCN Evaluation Collection 2-page summary.**

751 **S2\_Text. QCN papers common methods section.**

752 **S3\_Text. QCN papers common country context**

753

## 754 **References**

- 755 1. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, Jordan K, Leslie HH, Roder-DeWan S, et al. High-  
756 quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. *The*  
757 *Lancet Global health*. 2018;6(11):e1196-e252. Epub 2018/09/10. doi: 10.1016/s2214-  
758 109x(18)30386-3. PubMed PMID: 30196093.
- 759 2. National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. *Crossing the Global*  
760 *Quality Chasm: Improving Health Care Worldwide* (<https://doi.org/10.17226/25152> accessed  
761 21 Dec 2022). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018.
- 762 3. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, The World Bank.  
763 *Delivering quality health services: a global imperative for universal health coverage*. Geneva:  
764 World Health Organization, 2018.
- 765 4. World Health Organization. *Quality of care for maternal, newborn, child and*  
766 *adolescent health* ([https://www.who.int/teams/maternal-newborn-child-adolescent-health-](https://www.who.int/teams/maternal-newborn-child-adolescent-health-and-ageing/quality-of-care)  
767 [and-ageing/quality-of-care](https://www.who.int/teams/maternal-newborn-child-adolescent-health-and-ageing/quality-of-care) accessed 21 Dec 2022) 2022.
- 768 5. Quality of Care Network secretariat. 19 February 2017 - Media Coverage of the  
769 launch of the Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child  
770 Health ( [https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/index.php/updates/19-february-2017-media-](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/index.php/updates/19-february-2017-media-coverage-launch-network-improving-quality-care-maternal-newborn-and)  
771 [coverage-launch-network-improving-quality-care-maternal-newborn-and](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/index.php/updates/19-february-2017-media-coverage-launch-network-improving-quality-care-maternal-newborn-and) accessed 21  
772 December 2022) 2017.
- 773 6. The Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal Newborn and Child Health.  
774 *Quality, Equity, Dignity. A Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn*  
775 *and Child Health* (see <http://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/> (accessed 21 Dec 2022) for  
776 details) 2022.

- 777 7. Shawar Y, Djellouli N, Shiffman J, Akter K, Kinney MV, Mwaba K, et al. Factors  
778 Shaping Network Emergence: A Cross-Country Comparison of Quality of Care Networks in  
779 Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi & Uganda. (under review). 2023.
- 780 8. The Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal Newborn and Child Health.  
781 Quality, equity, dignity: the network to improve quality of care for maternal, newborn and  
782 child health – strategic objectives  
783 (<https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/272612/9789241513951-eng.pdf> accessed  
784 21 Dec 2022). Geneva: World Health Organization, 2018.
- 785 9. World Health Organization. The Network For Improving Quality of Care for  
786 Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health. Evolution, Implementation and Progress. 2017-2020  
787 Report. Geneva: WHO, 2021.
- 788 10. Akter K, Shawar Y, Tesfa A, Daniels-Howell C, Seruwagi G, Kyambulani A, et al.  
789 Influences on policy-formulation, decision-making, organisation and management for  
790 maternal, newborn and child health in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda: the roles  
791 and legitimacy of a multi-country network (under review). 2023.
- 792 11. Shiffman J, Quissell K, Schmitz HP, Pelletier DL, Smith SL, Berlan D, et al. A  
793 framework on the emergence and effectiveness of global health networks. Health Policy and  
794 Planning. 2016;31(suppl\_1):i3-i16. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czu046.
- 795 12. Yin RK. Case Study Research Design and Methods. California: Thousand Oaks, Sage  
796 publications; 2014.
- 797 13. Yin RK. Case Study Research and Aplications. Design and Methods, 6th Edition.  
798 California: Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications; 2018.
- 799 14. Olivier de Sardan J-P, Diarra A, Moha M. Travelling models and the challenge of  
800 pragmatic contexts and practical norms: the case of maternal health. Health Research Policy

- 801 and Systems. 2017;15(Suppl 1):60. doi: 10.1186/s12961-017-0213-9. PubMed PMID:  
802 PMC5516842.
- 803 15. Lipsky M. Street-Level Bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services,  
804 30th Anniversary Expanded Edition: Russell Sage Foundation; 2010.
- 805 16. Seruwagi G, Mwaba K, Tesfa A, Dube A, Mwandira K, Akter K, et al. How to  
806 evaluate a multi-country implementation-focused network: lessons from the Quality of Care  
807 Network (QCN) evaluation PLOS Global Public Health. 2023;(under review).
- 808 17. Patton MQ. Qualitative research & evaluation methods : integrating theory and  
809 practice. Fourth edition ed. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2015.
- 810 18. Brown BB, Haines M, Middleton S, Paul C, D'Este C, Klineberg E, et al.  
811 Development and validation of a survey to measure features of clinical networks. BMC  
812 Health Services Research. 2016;16(1):531. doi: 10.1186/s12913-016-1800-0.
- 813 19. Dube A, Akter K, Khatun F, Abreham SL, Monjeza G, Seruwagi G, et al. Developing  
814 a theory of change to improve the functioning of The Network for Improving Quality of Care  
815 for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health. (in preparation). 2023.
- 816 20. Mukinda FK, Djellouli N, Akter K, Sarker M, Tufa AA, Mwandira K, et al.  
817 Individual and organisational interactions, learning and information sharing in a multi-  
818 country implementation-focused quality of care network for maternal, newborn and child  
819 health: a stakeholder network analysis. PLOS Global Public Health. 2023;(under review).
- 820 21. Tesfa A, Nakidde C, Akter K, Khatun F, Mwandira K, Lemma S, et al. Individual,  
821 organisational and system capacities, and the functioning of a multi-country implementation-  
822 focused network for maternal, newborn and child health: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and  
823 Uganda,. PLOS Global Public Health. 2023;(under review).
- 824 22. World Health Organization. Standards for Improving Quality of Maternal and  
825 Newborn Care in Health Facilities. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2016.

- 826 23. World Health Organization. Standards for Improving the Quality of Care for Children  
827 and Young Adolescents in Health Facilities. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2018.
- 828 24. World Health Organization. Standards for Improving the Quality of Care for Small  
829 and Sick Newborns in Health Facilities. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020.
- 830 25. The Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal Newborn and Child Health.  
831 Quality of Care for Maternal and Newborn Health: A Monitoring Framework for Network  
832 Countries ([https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/sites/default/files/2022-  
833 05/2430%20M%26E%20Framework%20290219%20pressready\\_0.pdf](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/2430%20M%26E%20Framework%20290219%20pressready_0.pdf) accessed 21 Dec  
834 2022). 2019.
- 835 26. World Health Organisation. The Global Strategy for Women's Children's and  
836 Adolescents' Health (2016-2030). Geneva: World Health Organisation, 2015.
- 837 27. World Health Organization. Ending Preventable Maternal Mortality (EPMM) A  
838 Renewed Focus for Improving Maternal and Newborn Health and Well-Being. Geneva:  
839 World Health Organization, 2021.
- 840 28. WHO, UNICEF. Every Newborn: an action plan to end preventable deaths. Geneva:  
841 World Health Organization, 2014.
- 842 29. Mwandira K, Lemma S, Akter K, Tufa AA, Kyambulani A, Nakkide C, et al. Do  
843 Networks facilitate innovation, learning and sharing? An evaluation of the Quality-of-Care  
844 Network (QCN) in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda. PLOS Global Public Health.  
845 2023;(under review).
- 846 30. Government of Malawi. National MNCAH Quality of Care Roadmap (2017-2022).  
847 2017.
- 848 31. Government of Uganda. The Uganda Roadmap for Implementing the MNH Quality  
849 of Care Initiative. 2017.

- 850 32. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health. National MNH Quality  
851 of Care Roadmap (2017/18-2019/2020). International Institute for Primary Health Care,  
852 Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: MOH; 2017. Available from:  
853 <http://repository.iifphc.org/handle/123456789/738?show=full>. 2017.
- 854 33. Unicef. Every Mother Every Newborn (EMEN) Quality Improvement Guide for  
855 Health Facility Staff. New York: UNICEF, 2016.
- 856 34. Abreham SL, Daniels-Howell C, Tufa AA, Sarker M, Akter K, Nakkide C, et al.  
857 Opportunities to sustain a multi-country quality of care network: lessons on the actions of  
858 four countries Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda. PLOS Global Public Health.  
859 2023;(under review).
- 860 35. World Health Organization. Improving the quality of care for maternal, newborn and  
861 child health: implementation guide for  
862 national, district and facility levels. ([https://www.who.int/news/item/15-09-2022-improving-](https://www.who.int/news/item/15-09-2022-improving-the-quality-of-care-for-maternal--newborn-and-child-health--implementation-guide-for-national--district-and-facility-levels)  
863 [the-quality-of-care-for-maternal--newborn-and-child-health--implementation-guide-for-](https://www.who.int/news/item/15-09-2022-improving-the-quality-of-care-for-maternal--newborn-and-child-health--implementation-guide-for-national--district-and-facility-levels)  
864 [national--district-and-facility-levels](https://www.who.int/news/item/15-09-2022-improving-the-quality-of-care-for-maternal--newborn-and-child-health--implementation-guide-for-national--district-and-facility-levels) accessed 22 Dec 2022). Geneva: World Health  
865 Organization, 2022.
- 866 36. Brown BB, Patel C, McInnes E, Mays N, Young J, Haines M. The effectiveness of  
867 clinical networks in improving quality of care and patient outcomes: a systematic review of  
868 quantitative and qualitative studies. BMC Health Services Research. 2016;16(1):360. doi:  
869 10.1186/s12913-016-1615-z.
- 870

## Network Awareness




Figure 1

## Network Engagement




Figure 2



### Network perceived as valuable




Figure 3