

1 **Factors Shaping Network Emergence: A Cross-Country Comparison of Quality of Care Networks in**
2 **Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda**
3

4 **Authors:**

5 Yusra Ribhi Shawar^{1,2}, Nehla Djellouli³, Kohenour Akter,⁴ Will Payne¹, Mary Kinney⁵, Kasonde Mwaba,³ Gloria
6 Seruwagi,⁶ Mike English,⁷ Tanya Marchant,⁸ The QCN Evaluation Group,+ and Jeremy Shiffman^{1,2}, Tim Colbourn³
7

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ¹ Department of International Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA.

10 ² School of Advanced International Studies, John Hopkins University, Washington DC, USA.

11 ³ Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK

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

13 ⁵ School of Public Health, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa

14 ⁶ School of Public Health, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

15 ⁷ Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

16 ⁸ Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

17
18 + Membership list can be found in Acknowledgements section
19

20
21
22 * Corresponding author: Dr. Yusra Ribhi Shawar, Johns Hopkins University, yusra.shawar@jhu.edu
23

24 Keywords: network emergence, maternal health, child health, newborn health, global health partnerships, leadership,
25 action, learning, accountability
26
27

28 **Factors Shaping Network Emergence: A Cross-Country Comparison of Quality of Care Networks in**
29 **Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda**
30

31 **Abstract**
32
33

34 The Quality Care Network (QCN) was conceptualized by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and other global
35 partners to facilitate learning on and improve quality of care for maternal and newborn health within and across low
36 and middle-income countries. However, there was significant variance in the speed and extent in which QCN formed
37 in the involved countries. This paper investigates the factors that shaped QCN's differential emergence in Bangladesh,
38 Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda. Drawing on network scholarship, we conducted a replicated case study of the four
39 country cases and triangulated several sources of data, including a document review, observations of national-level and
40 district level meetings, and key informant interviews in each country and at the global level. Thematic coding was
41 performed in NVivo 12. We find that QCN emerged most quickly and robustly in Bangladesh, followed by Ethiopia,
42 then Uganda, and slowest and with least institutionalization in Malawi. Factors connected to the policy environment
43 and network features explained variance in network emergence. With respect to the policy environment, pre-existing
44 resources and initiatives dedicated to maternal and newborn health (MNH) and quality improvement, strong data and
45 health system capacity, and national commitment to advancing on synergistic goals were crucial drivers to QCN's
46 emergence. With respect to the features of the network itself, the embedding of QCN leadership in powerful agencies
47 with pre-existing coordination structures and trusting relationships with key stakeholders, inclusive network
48 membership, and effective individual national and local leadership were also crucial in explaining QCN's speed and
49 quality of emergence across countries. Studying QCN emergence provides critical insights as to why some well-
50 intentioned top-down global health networks don't materialize in some country contexts and have relatively quick
51 uptake in others, and has implications for a network's perceived legitimacy and ultimate effectiveness in producing
52 stated objectives.

53
54
55
56
57
58

59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85

Introduction

Proliferating in global health over the last three decades, networks are a growing subject of attention given their prevalence, critical role, and impact on population health outcomes.[1–7] Taking on a wide variety of forms and purposes, global health networks —“cross-national webs of individuals and organizations linked by a shared concern to address a particular health problem global in scope”[1]—are often engaged in research, advocacy, and/or program or policy design, learning, implementation or evaluation. They are critical in global health governance, given their role in contributing to knowledge accumulation, rule-setting, resource mobilization and allocation, and implementation—all of which have critical implications on how guidelines and policies are conceptualized and implemented in global health, as well as the nature of interactions among various stakeholders.[8]

Global health networks often include a wide variety of actors including academic institutions, governments, international organisations, UN agencies, foundations, and service providers.[1] Some networks focus on policy consequences and public goods development and provision—known as global public policy networks.[9] Others focus on knowledge generation and identification of causal relationships—known as epistemic communities.[10] And other networks are defined by their principled ideas and advocacy— known as transnational advocacy networks. [11] Some networks are formal in nature, such as the Partnership to End Violence Against Children[12]; others are more informal and dynamic such as the largely LMIC-based network of physicians concerned with rheumatic heart disease.[13] Despite growing scholarship on the subject, [14–17] relatively little remains known about how global health networks form and evolve. In particular, much less research has examined the emergence of global health implementation networks within country settings. Why do formal global health networks—largely initiated and conceptualized among international organizations and partners to improve health outcomes—form more easily within some countries and struggle to crystalize in others?

We explore this question through an examination of the Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal Newborn and Child Health, also known as the Quality Care Network (QCN). [18] Formally launched in 2017, QCN was conceptualized by the World Health Organization (WHO) and other global partners to facilitate learning and improvement of quality of care within and across low and middle-income countries (LMIC) in order to reduce mortality risks for millions of women and newborns and make progress towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals

86 (SDGs) and universal health coverage.[19] QCN represents an effort to bring together historically siloed maternal,
87 newborn, and child health (MNCH) interventions and broader quality improvement efforts; [20] in the past, little joint
88 learning had taken place within and among LMICs about evidence-based and best practices for supporting quality of
89 care improvement for MNCH. [21]

90 All eleven ‘pathfinder’ LMICs that joined QCN exhibited a high maternal mortality rate and their governments
91 made some level of political commitment to improving quality of care for maternal and newborn health. Despite these
92 similarities, there was a clear spectrum of QCN emergence across the pathfinder countries. This paper investigates the
93 factors shaping variance in the QCN’s emergence in four of the pathfinder countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi,
94 and Uganda. We chose these four countries because they represent a range of contexts and starting points.

95 Network “emergence” is defined as the crystallization of an organized group of actors around a shared problem.[1]
96 Drawing on scholarship in philosophy, we understand network emergence as “the arising of novel and coherent
97 structures, patterns and properties during the process of self-organization in complex systems”.[22] Given this
98 understanding and building on scholarship focused on emergence from various disciplines,[23,24] we understand
99 network emergence to be on a spectrum, rather than binary,[25–27] exemplified by: 1) radical novelty (i.e. displaying a
100 new property or function); 2) coherence (i.e., maintenance or consistency over a period of time); 3) a global or macro
101 level (i.e., the entirety being interconnected); 4) ostensibility (it can be perceived or the member parts are aware of it).[28]

102 In this paper, we characterize network emergence in each country in terms of the extent of awareness, communication
103 and coordination of actors dedicated to quality improvement for MNCH across global, national, and local levels, as well
104 as the speed of formation. Strong QCN emergence within a country is exhibited by the relatively quick awareness,
105 harmonization, and institutionalization of the global network’s goals and activities among country actors and structures.
106 In contrast, countries exhibiting weak QCN emergence do not uptake global activities or do so partially and/or at a
107 slower pace.

108 Studying QCN *emergence*—as opposed to the network’s ultimate *effectiveness* in producing outcomes related to quality
109 improvement—provides critical insights as to why some well-intentioned top-down global health networks don’t
110 materialize in some country contexts and have relatively quick uptake in others. The pattern, speed, and extent of a
111 network’s initial emergence is likely to reflect and have implications on a network’s legitimacy, configurations and

112 interactions among involved actors, and ultimate effectiveness in producing stated objectives—each of which are
113 discussed respectively by Akter et al,[29] Mukinda et al, [30] and Djellouli et al.[31] in this paper series. An understanding
114 of the key factors shaping variable network emergence across these countries is critical to WHO and global partners, as
115 they seek to establish QCN activities in other countries, but also more broadly for policymakers seeking to initiate global
116 health networks and partnerships across various contexts.

117 *QCN emergence at the global level*

118 In order to understand the extent of QCN emergence at the country level, it is critical to provide background
119 on the network's emergence at the global level. QCN was a product of a confluence of ongoing efforts to improve
120 global MNCH and an increased emphasis on quality of care. From 2014 to 2016, UNICEF's Every Mother Every
121 Newborn (EMEN) project, which was funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), sought to establish
122 mother and baby friendly hospitals across LMICs.[32] In August 2016, WHO published Standards for Improving
123 Quality of Maternal and Newborn Care in Health Facilities.[33] Thereafter, individuals at the WHO, the Institute for
124 Healthcare Improvement (IHI), and UNICEF began to discuss the possibility of developing an implementation strategy
125 for these standards, motivated to see the standards translated into sustained results. WHO then gathered several multi-
126 sector partners, including donors, academics, governing bodies, and country technical partners, such as USAID, Jhpiego,
127 UNFPA, and others, to discuss what this could look like. These initial talks raised awareness of the problem that there
128 were many actors engaged in MNCH and quality of care in various countries but that each was working in silos, with
129 few examples of successful, consistent, scalable, and sustainable approaches to the many facets of improving quality of
130 care for mothers and children. This led to the idea of a network where all these actors could attempt to work together
131 and both partners and countries could share and learn from one another to establish one joint approach. Following
132 initial conversations, WHO's director of Department of Maternal Newborn Child Adolescent Health advanced the idea
133 of establishing a learning network across LMICs with the primary aim of reducing maternal and neonatal fatality.

134 In October 2016, WHO and partners approached nine pathfinder countries (Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire,
135 Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Malawi, Nigeria, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania) to join the network; Sierra
136 Leone joined in 2017, and Kenya, in 2019. These countries were asked to join the network because they were perceived

137 by WHO and partners to be well-positioned to make rapid progress; each country demonstrated political will and
138 commitment for improving MNCH, as well as strong funding and technical support from partners. [34]

139 [34]From the outset, QCN aimed to build off ongoing efforts rather than reinvent or establish an additional silo. It was
140 expected that pathfinder countries be willing to transparently share data within the network, have a desire to learn and
141 develop, and that international actors and countries join together—under the leadership of the participating countries’
142 health ministries—to learn from one another, rather than acting in competition, and implement solutions to improve
143 quality of care. The QCN differed from many prior global health networks in that its purpose was to operationalize
144 quality improvement within countries to reduce mortality, rather than draw donors’ and global actors’ attention to
145 specific health challenges.[5,12,13,35,36]

146 QCN was officially launched in Lilongwe, Malawi in February 2017.[37] There, strategic objectives were announced
147 and an official guide to the network’s goals and intentions, titled “Quality, Equity, Dignity: A Network for Improving
148 Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health Implementation Guidance” was distributed.[38] The meeting
149 was attended by 340 representatives of the ten initial pathfinder countries and global partners. The partners produced
150 an agreement on the primary network aims: 1) reduce maternal and newborn mortality, and specifically reduce maternal
151 and newborn deaths and stillbirths in participating health facilities by 50% over five years; and 2) improve the experience
152 of care.[19,33] In order to accomplish these goals, it was agreed to apply the WHO’s “QED” (Quality, Equity and
153 Dignity) and “LALA” (Leadership, Accountability, Learning, and Action) implementation frameworks to quality of care
154 initiatives in partner countries.[39] The network sought to support the implementation of national frameworks for
155 quality improvement via: (i) leadership by building and strengthening national institutions and processes for improving
156 quality of care; (ii) action by accelerating and sustaining implementation of quality-of-care improvement packages
157 through operationalizing a standards-based approach to quality improvement; (iii) learning by promoting joint learning
158 and generating evidence on quality planning, improvement and control of health services; and (iv) accountability by
159 developing, strengthening and sustaining institutions and mechanisms for accountability of quality maternal, neonatal
160 and child health services that are equitable and dignified.[40] Subsequent international meetings facilitated global QCN
161 emergence and development, including meetings in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania in December 2017, and in Addis Ababa in

162 March 2019, which involved 11 additional observer countries.[41] Figure 1 details the timeline concerning the emergence
163 of QCN at the global level, and when countries joined.

164 [Insert Figure 1 here]

165
166 In terms of the network’s structure at the global level: WHO was the global coordinating body; it provided guidance
167 on how to improve the technical quality of care, while also advising on monitoring and evaluation, and organizing formal
168 multi-country, multi-stakeholder network engagement, which facilitated learning, especially between the countries.
169 Other partners included other UN agencies, such as UNICEF (which was the co-leader of QCN with WHO) and
170 UNFPA (providing technical support); BMGF, which provided funding to the QCN Secretariat and to UNICEF in-
171 country for national implementation; IHI, which led in the development of quality improvement approaches in-country
172 and provided technical support; and USAID, which proved to be a key implementing partner in-country. The
173 engagement of high-level staff from UN agencies and prominent funders were critical to the strong emergence of QCN
174 at the global level.[42]

175 **Methods**

176 **Theory: Global Health Networks Emergence**

177 This analysis draws on the social science scholarship that examines networks broadly, but also global health
178 networks and global health partnerships specifically. This body of literature identifies several key factors shaping
179 network emergence.[1,2,43–47] We modified these for relevance to global health network emergence within country
180 settings and group them into two categories of factors: policy environment and network features. Table 1 presents the
181 factors shaping global health network emergence according to these two broad categories. Policy environment pertains
182 to the developments and dynamics external to the network. Specifically, these encompass the pre-existing structures
183 and dynamics that emerging networks must navigate. According to social science scholarship,[1] a network is more likely
184 to strongly emerge, that is crystalize more quickly and be of greater quality, in-country when: there are established
185 country policies, programs, and funding dedicated to the issue of concern, there are country systems that are capable of
186 collecting and reporting on the severity of the problem, and the country’s political elites—as well as the frontline
187 workers— are motivated to advance the issue and believe they are able to address it.

188 A second set of factors concerns network features, which involve the strategy, structure, and attributes of the actors
 189 that constitute the network. Specifically, scholarship on collective action points to two network features that may be
 190 particularly influential for network emergence: its governance and leadership. [1,2] Concerning governance, a network
 191 is more likely to strongly emerge in a country when it includes locals in decision-making processes, network members
 192 are embedded in powerful agencies or hold key decision-making positions, and there are pre-existing and trusting
 193 relationships between involved actors; this is likely to contribute to effective communication and coordination among
 194 involved actors in achieving collective goals. Concerning leadership, networks are more likely to emerge when there are
 195 long-standing and respected in-country champions dedicated to the subject, capable of directing and sustaining the
 196 network’s growth and development. [48,49]

197
 198 **Table 1:** Factors Shaping Global Health Network Emergence and Effectiveness

Impact on Network Emergence	
Policy Environment	
Resources and initiatives dedicated to the issue in-country	Countries with existing policies, programs, and funding for an issue will more likely facilitate network emergence for that issue, given that these resources reflect pre-existing commitments and actors dedicated to the issue. In contrast, a dearth of such resources are likely to hinder motivation for new efforts, as the creation of the network is more likely to be seen as intractable or unsustainable.
Data and health system capacity in-country	Systems that are capable of collecting and reporting on the severity of problem, as well as those that have health systems that are in a better position to take up relevant initiatives (i.e., quality improvement), will lead to network emergence, given that there is a basis for coming together given demonstrated burden and demonstrated tractability.
Political developments and legacies/ country leadership priorities in-country	Networks are more likely to emerge when political elites have interest in advancing the issue, and there are ‘policy windows’ that highlight their need; also, networks are more likely to emerge in politically stable environments (no domestic conflict) given that network establishment requires movement and coordination, that environments with domestic conflict and/or tumultuous political leadership are likely to obstruct.
Nature of Network	
Governance	Networks are more likely to emerge when they include national and local stakeholders in decision-making processes, and some of these stakeholders are embedded in powerful agencies or hold key decision-making positions, and there are pre-existing and trusting relationships between involved actors at the international, national and sub-national levels. These pre-existing interactions, and the trust they create among involved actors, are foundational for generating networked activities.
Leadership	Networks are more likely to emerge if effective leaders exist, capable of bringing relevant actors across a network together, and once linked, in guiding them to effective collective action for establishing a network.

199 **Replicated Case Study and Case Justification**

200 We conducted a replicated case study [50]—a method relying chiefly on within and between-case analyses. We
 201 employed a most similar case approach given the four country cases—Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda—are
 202 similar in a number of ways (i.e., issue characteristics: the QCN network across each of these countries seeks to improve
 203 MNCH outcomes), but vary on a number of variables of interest (which in this case, are network features and policy
 204 environment). We utilized a process tracing methodology, [51] a qualitative case study research strategy commonly
 205 employed in political science that seeks to uncover the mechanisms that underpin cause and effect relationships. In

206 doing so, we explored why the causal mechanisms (i.e. in this case, relying solely on issue characteristics in explaining
207 network emergence) break down and what other factors have to be present in order to more appropriately explain
208 variance in network emergence across the four cases. The objective is explanatory: to probe for new—but as of yet
209 unspecified—explanations & identify alternative causal factors.

210 211 **Data Collected**

212 We triangulated across several sources of data including a document review, observations, and key informant
213 interviews. With respect to the document review, we reviewed all accessible published and unpublished documents and
214 communications relating to the QCN at global level and at national and sub-national levels across the four countries of
215 study. These included strategy and management documents, operational plans, directives, formal minutes, and reports.

216
217 In the supplement, we summarize the document review completed pertaining to each country and at the global
218 level [S2_Text. QCN papers common methods]. We were able to access unpublished documents via WHO, as well as
219 QCN contacts within the Ministries of Health in the four countries of study. In terms of observations, we conducted
220 non-participant observations [52] of multi-country meetings and key national-level and district level meetings. Activities
221 at district level were also observed via visits to two better and two least performing QCN hospitals in several iterative
222 rounds. This is summarized in Table 3 of the supplement [S2_Text. QCN papers common methods]. Best and worst
223 performing sites were selected based on maternal and newborn health outcomes and other quality of care data (e.g.,
224 those used in national schemes). We used templates to capture key processes relevant to the focus of the network at
225 each site during observations, as well as unstructured notes. The observations were used, among other purposes, to
226 explore whether actors involved at various levels feel anything has changed over the period of QCN operation. To
227 ensure our observations were informative they were conducted by trained and experienced researchers familiar with the
228 local setting, and recorded in detailed field notes.

229 We also conducted semi-structured interviews, with global, national, and local level network members and key
230 stakeholders, including employees of implementing INGOs, academic partners, representatives of the countries'
231 Ministries of Health, and managing actors and clinicians within district hospitals and health sites. Details of how these
232 were conducted are provided in the supplementary material [S2_Text. QCN papers common methods]. We sought to

233 pay particular attention to the perspectives and goals of those carrying out the work of the network.[53,54] At the
234 national and local levels, we conducted several iterative rounds of interviews across the four countries, at least six
235 months apart, to capture changes in how the network was operating and views pertaining to network activities as well
236 as follow-up on emerging findings from the previous round. The number of rounds and the number of interviews with
237 global, national and local level stakeholders in each round are provided in Table 1 of the supplementary material
238 [S2_Text. QCN papers common methods].

239 **Data Analysis**

240 The analysis was iterative, exploring emerging findings and drawing on network and global health partnership
241 scholarship and frameworks,[55] resulting in use of both inductive and deductive approaches.[52] While our qualitative
242 codebook remained closely grounded in social science scholarship concerning network emergence, we modified key
243 informant selection and the content of our interview guides throughout the study to invite participants to reflect on
244 earlier findings, and to address topical blind spots. Coding was performed in NVivo 12, using a codebook consisting of
245 “case study” codes and “theory” codes. The bulk of our coding framework and qualitative data analysis for interview,
246 observation, and document review data consisted of a deductive, manifest content analysis process. In this process,
247 predetermined codes, largely based on theoretical frameworks referenced in the theory section [1,56] were applied to
248 meaning units—the smallest unit of text which answered the research aim—in each file.[57]

249 Our codebook was prepared via generation of an outline of each relevant theory (summarized in S2_Text.
250 QCN papers common methods). The codebook provided to the project’s coding staff included reference papers for
251 further reading, as well as detailed descriptions of each theoretical unit and of each code. Coders were also introduced
252 to the codebook and coding software via a global webinar, and coders underwent an iterative training and
253 standardization processes in which groups of coders, including at least one project lead researcher having close
254 familiarity with the project theoretical components, identified and coded meaning units in a closed set of 3-5 files, and
255 results were compared and discussed.[58] This allowed us to initiate a relatively high level of inter-coder consistency.

256 We applied a process of decontextualization, recontextualization, categorization, and compilation in conducting
257 our qualitative data analysis.[57] In decontextualization,[59] each file was read by the coder in order to understand its
258 context and content, and meaning units were identified and labeled with a code. Immediately subsequent to
259

260 decontextualization, the coder reviewed the same document again, observing areas in which no codes had been applied,
261 and determining whether these areas were relevant to the research aim. Additional codes were then applied if the content
262 was determined to be relevant.[57,60] The categorization process was relatively straightforward due to our use of a
263 deductive codebook, as analysis was conducted by viewing the meaning units regrouped to each theoretical component,
264 including the relevant headings and sub-headings suggested by the theory.[57] Finally, our compilation process involved
265 manifest analysis, via the preparation of narrative qualitative syntheses that employed both direct quotes and narrative
266 summaries of the direct textual content of each file.[57] These documents took the form of informal working papers
267 prepared on each theoretical topic under analysis and offered an additional opportunity for “sanity checking” our
268 conclusions with broader groups of in-country and global researchers who were not directly involved with the coding
269 and analysis process. Due to the lengthy and iterative nature of our data collection process, the preparation of these
270 interim syntheses also presented an opportunity to reformulate the qualitative interview guide when information was
271 determined to be missing or incomplete.

272

273 *Ethics*

274 Ethical approval was received from University College London Research Ethics Committee (ref: 3433/003); BADAS
275 Ethical Review Committee (ref: BADAS-ERC/EC/19/00274), Ethiopian Public Health Institute Institutional Review
276 Board (ref: EPHI-IRB-240-2020), National Health Sciences Research Committee in Malawi (ref: 19/03/2264) and
277 Makerere University Institutional Review Board (ref: Protocol 869).

278

278 **Results**

279

280 We begin by discussing the extent of QCN emergence at the national level in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda.
281 Specifically, we briefly describe how QCN formed within these countries, and the quality and speed of its crystallization.
282 We then examine key policy environment and network features shaping QCN’s emergence in each country. We conclude
283 by discussing the key factors influencing QCN’s emergence across the countries comparatively and discussing the
284 finding’s implications for creating a successful multi-country network, across various contexts, for MNCH and other
285 issues in global health.

286 **QCN emergence at the national level: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda**

287 QCN emerged in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda between 2016 and 2019. Despite involvement of
 288 many of the same actors across the four countries (summarized in table 1 of supporting material), the quality and speed
 289 of QCN’s emergence varied (summarized in table 2). QCN emerged most quickly and robustly in Bangladesh, followed
 290 by Ethiopia, then Uganda, and least robustly in Malawi. In Bangladesh, and to some extent Ethiopia, QCN structures
 291 were established more quickly, with in-country institutionalization of a global network’s goals and activities, and
 292 communication and coordination of actors across the global, national, and local levels. In contrast, in Malawi and to
 293 some extent Uganda, QCN emergence occurred at a slower pace and there was fragmentation—and in some cases, a
 294 complete lack of awareness—of activities and actors across sub-national, national and global levels. A global respondent
 295 noted variance of QCN emergence across two of the pathfinder countries, in terms of the speed in which the districts
 296 were selected and extent to which related activities were documented and aligned with global partners:

297 “Bangladesh...they can show you: This is what we did in these districts and...we use these standards to do this.
 298 It’s very different than let’s say Malawi....the[ir] learning districts ha[ve] been a challenge; picking the districts,
 299 getting aligned with the partners in countries...”

300
301
302

Table 2: Emergence of QCN in Four Pathfinding Countries

	Bangladesh	Ethiopia	Uganda	Malawi
Overall strength of QCN emergence	Strongest	Strong	Moderate	Weak
Speed of initiation	Fastest	Fast	Slow ● Not until early 2019	Slow ● Not until early to mid-2019
Extent of QCN harmonization, integration, and institutionalization of the proposed goals and activities into existing country structures	Strong	Strong/Moderate ● Some key actors initially not involved	Moderate/Weak ● Difficulties finding appropriate institutional host placement ● Disjointed implementation structures ● Lack of engagement; limited to organizations or partners that were already Ministry partners on MNCH issues	Weak ● Some actors unaware they are part of QCN
Degree of QCN communication and coordination among and across relevant global, national, and local actors	Moderate ● Communication and coordination with local level lagging	Moderate ● Communication and coordination with local level lagging	Weak ● Initially no implementation or monitoring plan ● Fragmented implementation of activities	Weak ● Initially no/little communication with learning districts
Why/how country engaged in QCN (as perceived by national and local members)	Joint effort by Government and WHO; country members perceived to be pioneering work in quality improvement	Introduced in meeting called by WHO	Initiated by WHO because of low performance in maternal and newborn healthcare and existing quality work	Initiated by WHO because of low performance in maternal and newborn healthcare

303
304
305

Emergence of QCN in Bangladesh.

306 In Bangladesh, many respondents described their country’s engagement with QCN to be a result of their
307 pioneering efforts in quality improvement. Several in-country respondents perceived QCN’s emergence as a joint effort
308 by the government and WHO. An implementing partner in Bangladesh described the network’s emergence:

309 “Both WHO and Government had initiative because if government does not want, it will not be done. If
310 WHO does not want, it will not be done as well. As both have agreed, it has been done.”

311
312 Some connected the country’s joining QCN to UNICEF’s Every Mother, Every Newborn (EMEN) project (2016-
313 2018), and specifically the attendance of the UNICEF Bangladesh country office at the global meeting in 2016; after
314 expressing interest in joining the network, it was discussed with the government, which initiated its establishment in the
315 country. Thereafter, QCN quickly formed; it was integrated within Bangladesh’s Quality Improvement Secretariat
316 (QIS)—which had been at the center of the country’s quality improvement activities since 2015. Housed within the
317 Health Economics Unit (HEU), QIS serves as a formal management body of the National Quality Improvement
318 Committee. Other long-standing development partners within the country were equally engaged as part of the network
319 at the highest levels, including WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, Save the Children, and USAID. Various professional
320 associations, such as the Obstetrical and Gynaecological Society of Bangladesh, and global partners, such as University
321 Research Co. (URC), were involved to provide technical support and capacity building. The goals among global,
322 national, and to some extent local actors aligned and mechanisms were put in place relatively quickly to foster
323 communication and coordination across these actors—from the global QCN Secretariat to the local Civil Surgeons—
324 in order to implement QCN activities. Beginning in 2016—even before the formal launch of QCN—the Ministry of
325 Health and Family Welfare had already identified and began work in the first round of learning districts—Kurigram and
326 Narsingdhi—as part of QCN.[61] Rapid scale up to additional districts followed shortly after.

327
328 *Emergence of QCN in Ethiopia.*
329

330 In Ethiopia, unlike Bangladesh, respondents reported WHO as fully initiating the emergence of the national
331 network by inviting their country to be part of QCN in a meeting in 2016. One Ethiopian national partner described
332 this and the relatively weaker communication between the Ministry of Health and its partners during QCN’s
333 establishment:

334 “In 2016, we went to Geneva to evaluate the work of [maternal and newborn health]. At the meeting,
335 I heard that QCN is to be launched by the initiation of WHO. At the time we heard that the document
336 is prepared and countries were selected. We had discussed that we have to involve in the network
337 representing my institution in Ethiopia...Prior to the meeting, WHO had discussed with the
338 government and Ethiopia was already selected.”
339

340 In 2017, the Ministry of Health in collaboration with WHO further discussed and subsequently established the network
341 in Ethiopia. Led by the WHO and the Ministry of Health, they identified interested partners, created forums and
342 mobilized resources. QCN members were initially coordinated by the Ministry of Health with substantial support from
343 WHO; together they set the goals, developed a roadmap and guidelines, and facilitated the implementation of the
344 network in the selected facilities, with the support of implementing partners—such as IHI, Clinton Health Access
345 Initiative (CHAI), WHO, Transform HDR, and Transform PHCU. The network emerged relatively fast and
346 coordination, recognition, commitment and supervision of QCN was initially strong at the national level. The new
347 quality directorate supported its institutionalization, and there was strong alignment with government policies and pre-
348 existing large-scale programs on quality improvement. By 2017, a TWG, consisting of representatives of different
349 partners, was established, a national roadmap [17] called LALI (Leadership, Accountability, Learning, Implementation,
350 alternatively used to LALA) was developed, and 48 learning facilities were identified and selected quickly. However, the
351 network initially faced challenges penetrating sub-national levels, where communication and establishment of
352 coordination structures lagged, and many were unaware of the roadmap. Furthermore, unlike Bangladesh, Ethiopian
353 respondents noted that several key actors—including global implementing partners and local institutions that worked
354 on mother’s and children’s health—were initially absent from the network, hindering some institutionalization of the
355 network’s activities. These included Engender Health, Marie Stops International (renamed MSI Reproductive Choice
356 in 2020), Save the Children, Ethiopian family planning association, and some key units in the MoH structure. A sub-
357 national respondent described some of the actors that were missing from the network:

358 “Institutions who work in relation to mothers and children's health should have been involved. For
359 example, Save the Children works on child health projects in our region. They should have been
360 members of the MCH unit...They are doing the same job and it avoids duplication of resources.”
361

362 *Emergence in Uganda.*
363

364 In Uganda, like Ethiopia, it was perceived that WHO fully initiated QCN. In particular, respondents stressed that their
365 country was participating in QCN because of its low performance in maternal and newborn healthcare. Their country’s

366 statistics remained poor despite a significant increase in facility births. A respondent working in the Ministry of Health
367 in Uganda noted how this justified and catalyzed engagement in QCN:

368
369 “Looking at our data, we were seeing that despite having mothers delivering from medical facilities,
370 under skilled health care workers, we were not seeing much more reduction in maternal deaths and
371 newborn deaths. So we felt there was need for us to focus on quality of the services rather than just
372 pushing more mothers into our facilities. So, the time was right for us to start implementing this.”
373

374 Like Bangladesh and Ethiopia, an existing structure for improving quality of care was in place in Uganda. However,
375 unlike the former countries, the network’s emergence was initially more disjointed: facility-level teams and activities
376 related to quality of care for MNCH were largely dysfunctional, with some quality improvement teams at the facility
377 level not fully operational and little clarity among those involved about the extent of their ongoing activity. While
378 Uganda formally launched QCN in 2017, the roadmap and operational plan were developed later; the former not until
379 2018 (and later revised in 2020) and the latter not until the end of 2019. The network would only begin to take shape
380 in 2019 with the appointment of a focal person dedicated to QCN and the network’s new placement in the renamed
381 Standards Compliance Accreditation Patient Protection (SCAPP) department under the Directorate of Governance and
382 Regulation. The network was characterized as lacking clarity and coordination in its implementation, with many involved
383 also lacking awareness of the roadmap and operational plan, and no monitoring plan to keep involved actors
384 accountable.

385
386 *QCN Emergence in Malawi*

387 In Malawi, WHO invited the country to join QCN. Similar to Uganda, Malawi was especially eager to join given
388 its poor MNCH indicators. Stakeholders from the Ministry of Health perceived the QCN as an opportunity for Malawi
389 to learn about best practices to reduce maternal mortality and improve the quality of care offered to mothers and
390 children. One implementing partner respondent noted this:

391 “Malawi got involved in the quality of care network because Malawi has a number of issues to do with
392 quality. For example, we have our skilled attendance at birth at 91% but we still have a high maternal
393 mortality ratio of 439 per 100,000. If you question this, you will see that it is an issue of quality because
394 what it means is that most women are dying in the hands of workers... so I think government made a
395 decision that they will join this quality of care network so we can improve the quality of care for
396 everybody in Malawi.”
397

398 QCN was placed in the Government’s Quality Management Directorate (QMD), which was a small unit within the
 399 Ministry of Health. The WHO assisted the Ministry in gathering key stakeholders, which formed the TWG coordinating
 400 body that was charged with planning and the implementation of QCN in the country. In addition to the Reproductive
 401 Health Directorate, other key stakeholders at the national level included UNICEF, UNFPA, GIZ, and others, which
 402 were essential technical and funding partners that coordinated network efforts and supported other community-based
 403 organizations (e.g. Society of Medical Doctors and MaiKhanda) directly to implement quality of care activities.
 404 However, QCN activities were not initially institutionalized; the network built little ties with the nursing and clinical
 405 departments, as well as the community health service division and district councils—especially crucial actors given the
 406 health system’s decentralization in Malawi. Other key partners were also absent from QCN in Malawi, including DFID
 407 and Save the Children. Similar to Uganda, there was initially little communication and coordination across network
 408 actors, especially at the local levels. QCN coordinating meetings were irregular and there were even periods of complete
 409 inactivity. Furthermore, learning sites were not selected until mid-2019, and many actors in the learning facilities were
 410 initially either unaware that they were learning sites or what their roles and responsibilities were as part of QCN. It was
 411 not until this time—almost three years from QCN’s official launch in Malawi—that the network began to take shape.

412 Factors That Explain QCN In-Country Emergence

413 Factors connected to the policy environment and network features in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and
 414 Uganda, which are discussed below, explain the variance in QCN’s emergence across the countries. These are
 415 summarized in table 3.

416 **Table 3:** Factors that shaped emergence of QCN in four pathfinding countries

	Bangladesh	Ethiopia	Uganda	Malawi
Policy Environment	Relatively Strong	Strong/Moderate	Moderate	Relatively Weak
Resources and initiatives dedicated to the issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality improvement (QI) initiatives predate QCN by several decades Several ongoing, nationwide QI activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful national network initiatives (EPAQ & EHAQ) Several ongoing, nationwide QI activities However, quality units at lower levels newly established units or didn’t exist at all, despite specification in 2015 National Quality Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior QI initiatives specifically focused on HIV, and not maternal and newborn health specifically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actors not aware of specifics of past QI initiatives Lack of national strategy to guide QI efforts
Data and health system capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively Strong Many health system capacity challenges concerning human resources and infrastructure Morale and motivation relatively high among health workforce Foundational work on national data system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak Many health system capacity challenges concerning human resources and infrastructure Morale and motivation relatively low among health workforce Foundational work on national data system; however new QCN indicators do not align 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak Many health system capacity challenges concerning human resources and infrastructure Morale and motivation relatively low among health workforce Lack of national monitoring and evaluation framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak Many health system capacity challenges concerning human resources and infrastructure Morale and motivation relatively low among health workforce Foundational work on national data system; however new QCN indicators do not align
Political developments and	Relatively Strong	Relatively Weak	Moderate	Moderate
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong commitments, but: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong commitments, but: Low healthcare funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong commitments, but:

legacies/country leadership priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong commitments (i.e., SDGs, universal health coverage, and national health sector plan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low healthcare funding and high out-of-pocket expenditure Political transition and unrest 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low healthcare funding and frequent budget cuts
Nature of Network				
Governance	<p style="text-align: center;">Strong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration in strong government agency: Quality Improvement Secretariat (QIS)—responsible for setting quality standards and introducing QI improvement procedures within medical facilities since 2015 Long history and high level of interaction and trust between many QCN implementing agencies (i.e., WHO, UNICEF, and Save the Children) and government actors 	<p style="text-align: center;">Moderate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration in strong government agency: Federal Ministry of Health of Ethiopia, which had strong QI infrastructure prior to 2015 Some history and level of previous interaction and trust between QCN implementing agencies (i.e., WHO, UNICEF, and Save the Children) and government actors Facility selection lacks adequate representation 	<p style="text-align: center;">Weak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially, led largely by WHO and partners, with support from Ministry of Health (embedded in relatively newer and weaker government unit) Implementing partners lack trust and working independently of one another Lack of community engagement in network 	<p style="text-align: center;">Weak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration in relatively smaller and weaker unit in Ministry of Health: Quality Management Directorate Relatively smaller previous history of interactions between QCN implementing partners and government Majority of involved partners requested to be in QCN vs. being invited or sought out
Leadership	<p style="text-align: center;">Strong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-standing, well-respected and charismatic leaders concerned with quality improvement 	<p style="text-align: center;">Moderate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially, no focal point for QCN 	<p style="text-align: center;">Moderate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially, no focal point for QCN and leadership capacity varying across districts 	<p style="text-align: center;">Weak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor leadership, especially at lower levels

417

418

Policy Environment

419

420

In terms of policy environment, a country’s pre-existing resources and initiatives dedicated to MNCH and quality improvement, data and health system capacity, and politics and leadership priorities were found to shape the emergence of QCN in each of these countries.

422

423

Resources and established country policies, programs, and initiatives dedicated to the problem

424

Pre-existing resources, policies, programs, and funding for MNCH and QI helped facilitate QCN emergence. These pre-existing resources fostered and/or were reflective of critical components in existence—such as a highly competent workforce, trusting working relationships with development partners, and perceived synergistic goals—that are crucial for establishing a cohesive network of actors. While pre-existing initiatives for MNCH and quality improvement were apparent in all four countries, their scope and degree of institutionalization and sustainability varied. In Bangladesh, quality improvement initiatives predated QCN by several decades, fostering a highly competent and effective cadre of national health leaders who understood the potential benefits offered by an international knowledge-sharing network and were willing to devote efforts in seeing through its creation. Respondents working in Bangladesh at Save the Children and UNICEF—the two QCN implementer partners—reported:

433

“The Government has many initiatives especially in the context of quality of care. It’s basically a Government program.”

434

435

436

“Before...this network, we have quality improvement program here. So Bangladesh was... leading compared to the other countries.”

437

438

439 Bangladesh’s first quality initiative, ‘Quality Assurance Project’, was piloted in some hospitals in 1994. Based on the
440 experience of this piloting project, the quality assurance program was included in the Health and Population Sector
441 Program (1993-2003) and continued until 2010. Subsequently, the paradigm shifted to ‘Quality Improvement
442 Approach’, with attention to quality growing with the adoption of the healthcare financing strategy (2012-2032). At the
443 time that QCN began to emerge in Bangladesh, there were various agencies engaged in several ongoing nationwide
444 quality improvement activities concerning MNCH. These included the Every Mother, Every Newborn (EMEN) project
445 (UNICEF initiated in 2015),[62] the maternal and perinatal death surveillance and review (MPDSR) (WHO, UNICEF,
446 and UNFPA were involved) [63] and the Maternal Newborn Care Strengthening Project (MaMoni MNCSP) (funded
447 by USAID, implemented by Save the Children, and initiated in 2007 and then subsequently again in 2018).[64] Many
448 respondents noted these and other positive partnerships that existed between the government and development partners
449 prior to QCN. One respondent described how UNICEF supported government-owned facilities according to the
450 framework and guidelines of the WHO, helping them with “capacity building, assessment, minor renovation, their
451 training; [and with] any change [that] is needed [for improving] quality of health services for the mother and children”.
452 In Bangladesh, QCN was perceived to build on existing quality improvement practices and existing relationships with
453 development partners, which could consolidate and further positive trends that were already underway.

454 Similarly, in Ethiopia, quality improvement initiatives by the Ministry of Health, IHI, WHO, and CHAI—all of
455 whom were QCN partners—pre-existed. The government demonstrated strong commitment to improving MNCH
456 between 1990 and 2015. [65,66] QCN emergence in Ethiopia was facilitated by these initiatives, which included recent
457 developments such as: the 2015 Health Sector Transformation Plan that emphasized quality and equity as core pillars,
458 [67] the 2016 National Quality Strategy [68] that prioritized maternal and newborn health and was co-developed by the
459 Ministry of Health with support from the IHI, and successful national networking initiatives such as the Ethiopian
460 Primary Healthcare Alliance for Quality (EPAQ) and Ethiopian Hospitals Alliance for Quality (EHAQ). Several
461 respondents noted how QCN’s emergence was facilitated by EHAQ[69], which was established by the Ministry of
462 Health in 2012 to improve the quality of hospitals in Ethiopia through collaborative learning and clustering of facilities
463 through referral. A national-level respondent explained:

464 “This network [QCN] was not the first here in Ethiopia; EHAQ was the biggest network countrywide and
465 its experience made us familiar with this one [QCN]. So, this is a favoring opportunity.”

466
467 Unlike Bangladesh, respondents in Ethiopia, however, reported that the quality units at regional or lower levels were
468 either newly established units or didn't exist at all, despite its specification in the National Quality Strategy. They also
469 reported challenges with the quality units aligning activities conducted by other units, especially those concerned with
470 maternal and child health (MCH):

471 “The other thing is there is a missed relationship gap between quality and MCH. Quality doesn't know
472 about works performed by MCH. Even MCH didn't go to the review meeting. They did not call the
473 MCH coordinators at the meeting. Therefore, MCH should be parallel. Both units should be integrated
474 and work for hand in hand.”
475

476 In both Bangladesh and Ethiopia, substantial funding resources for QCN and QI initiatives largely came from
477 global partners, including UNICEF and USAID—all prominent global QCN partners. This was particularly evident in
478 Bangladesh, where prior to QCN's emergence, the Government's Quality Improvement Secretariat (QIS) received most
479 of its funding and technical support from international donors, especially UNFPA, UNICEF, and Save the Children.
480 Crucially, all of these major funders were signed on with QCN and involved in regular national meetings with QIS to
481 coordinate efforts.

482
483 While respondents in Uganda and Malawi also discussed their long history of QI initiatives, they were not perceived
484 to be synergistic to the establishment of QCN to the same extent as Bangladesh and Ethiopia. In Uganda, respondents
485 highlighted that many of the prior QI initiatives were specifically focused on HIV, including antiretroviral therapy
486 provision and prevention of mother-to-child transmission. Also, the RMNCAH Sharpened Plan for Uganda,[70]
487 initiated in 2013, set out to address existing bottlenecks to reduce maternal, newborn, and child morbidity and mortality.
488 However, its initial iteration placed little emphasis on quality, and it was not until 2021—well after QCN's formal launch
489 —that the new Sharpened Plan highlighted quality of care. In Malawi, despite general agreement that QCN was built
490 on previous QI efforts, respondents could not specify what those efforts were. Several respondents, especially at the
491 local level, explained how previous MNH projects led by different stakeholders (e.g., UNICEF and Maikhandu Trust)
492 in different districts had introduced QI tools—such as 5S, continuous QI, TQM, mentorship—before the QCN
493 activities were implemented, but that there was no integration and sometimes duplication between the different projects
494 given the lack of a national strategy guiding quality improvement efforts.

495

496 *Data and health system structures and capacity*

497 Like many LMIC contexts, [71] all four countries reported health system capacity challenges, especially
498 concerning human resources and infrastructure. These challenges on the one hand posed challenges for in-country
499 QCN establishment given limited capacities, but in some cases further bolstered conviction and efforts around
500 establishing a networked learning approach, especially given limited resources. The latter occurred in Bangladesh.
501 Respondents reported numerous health system challenges including clinical standards not uniformly applied by all
502 providers, insufficient training and decision aids, long patient wait times, improper queue management, an inadequate
503 number of beds available at clinics, and insufficient number of healthcare personnel, especially medical doctors and
504 cleaning personnel, which contributed to long patient waits and unsanitary conditions in clinics. However, despite these
505 challenges, morale and motivation was relatively high among the health workforce in Bangladesh, who believed activities
506 associated with quality of care were essential to overcoming health system shortcomings.

507 This is in contrast to the situation in Ethiopia, Uganda and Malawi, where health worker motivation and morale
508 were reported by respondents to be low. This posed a challenge for QCN's establishment, given that the establishment
509 of new structures and processes, as well as the focus on quality of care, were perceived to be burdensome and not worth
510 the extra effort, especially in a context where they already felt overextended. Despite the Ethiopian government's
511 massive scale up of training and education for the health workforce in 2015, [67] there remained a shortage of key
512 maternal and newborn dedicated staff, [72] which respondents noted not only exacerbated low workforce motivation,
513 but also the high rate of turnover and attrition.[73,74] This hindered QCN's emergence at the sub-national level,
514 especially given that networked learning not only requires high commitment but also consistency over time. A
515 respondent working at the local level in Ethiopia noted:

516 "Due to the change of new laws called [business process reengineering] BPR, the health workers are
517 not paid duty payments and this is also another challenge for workers and administration. Due to lack
518 of incentive, the worker's commitment sharply dropped. They have already lost hope."
519

520 In Uganda, respondents described how difficulties with water, electricity, adequate space, roads, and waste
521 management not only made some quality of care standards difficult to fulfill, but also contributed to a lack of motivation

522 around quality of care—and QCN’s establishment—among healthcare workers who were told of the changes they are
523 supposed to make without the capacity to make them. As one Ugandan respondent working in an implementing partner
524 organization noted:

525 “We cannot really do much [on quality of care].... We do not have that foundation; it is really a pillar in
526 improving processes of small labor units yet the numbers are increasing every year...so you are telling a health
527 worker to ensure privacy but this is delivery unit where provision was not made for separating walls between
528 the separating beds.”
529

530 Respondents in Malawi noted similar reasons contributing to low workforce motivation and commitment and its impact
531 on QCN emergence in their country. Several respondents working in the Ministry of Health noted:

532 “So issues of quality issues they are to do with mindset. It’s high time we changed our mind so that we
533 focus on quality because people think it’s an extra type of work. But it’s not extra.”
534

535 “Motivation of staff [is] an issue. Most of our staff are demotivated out there...There are a lot of
536 demotivators...frustrations come with small issues like infrastructure in which the staff are working
537 in, career progression, [and lack of government] incentives. Government incentives because some of
538 them are working in remote [areas] but there are no incentives for them. You know they say I am
539 working in the remote area; how do I get motivated? What benefit am I getting? So there needs to be
540 a lot of improvement in the action part to support the people that are doing the action on the ground.”
541

542 There were also variances across the countries in terms of data systems for monitoring and evaluation. In
543 Bangladesh, there was some foundational work on a national data system, which helped measure QCN progress. For
544 example, Save the Children worked in MaMoni districts to implement an electronic health record that tracked individual
545 patients by name and personal ID number, and collected general quality improvement information such as stillbirths,
546 deliveries, ANC visits, and family planning services. UNICEF, Save the Children, and QIS worked in the early days of
547 QCN to include QCN indicators in the formal chain of quality data reporting. Furthermore, Management Information
548 Systems in Bangladesh operated through the Directorate General of Hospitals using the widespread DHIS2 software.
549 National level respondents in Bangladesh also noted the existing accountability mechanisms at QCN facilities for data
550 collection and reporting. When data is reported upwards from a local site, it is checked for completeness and accuracy
551 at several levels—first with a district hospital statistician, and then occasionally by quality improvement committee, and
552 then by the Residential Medical Officer, Upazilla Health and Family Planning Officer or by an implementing partner.
553 Ethiopia was also relatively far along in collecting and capturing quality improvement indicators. However, at baseline,
554 the Health Management Information System indicators designated to be used to benchmark improvement were found

555 to be of poor quality, inflated or non-existent. [75] In response, a parallel reporting system for QCN, which was meant
556 to be integrated in the next DHIS revision in 2022, was established. National-level respondents noted that QCN’s newly
557 introduced indicators did not align with the previous reporting system and this jeopardized the feasibility of high-quality
558 data capture:

559 “The parallel reporting system...is our biggest challenge. This is not included in DHIS 2. Extracting
560 these 15 common core indicators from the chart is a big challenge.”
561

562 In Malawi, parallel reporting systems for experiences of care indicators were also reported. Another challenge related to
563 documentation in Malawi was the poor quality of data collected and poor documentation practices and knowledge of
564 them among health workers. A respondent in the Ministry of Health noted how this made it difficult to assess the
565 outcomes of planned activities, monitor progress and support learning and the scaling up of evidence-based
566 interventions—essential aims of QCN and a critical requirement for QCN emergence. The most recent National
567 Evaluation Platform (NEP) data quality assessment identified material shortages, transportation challenges, limited
568 training opportunities and system level issues (unreliable power and/or internet connectivity, delayed reporting, missing
569 and incomplete reports) as some barriers to data quality.[76] In Uganda, respondents reported monitoring and
570 evaluation to be a weakness given the lack of a clear framework at the national level. Furthermore, the data collected
571 lacked community engagement, with the current strategy not formalizing opportunities to hear from patients and
572 communities at the facility or national level. Respondents had little awareness of ongoing monitoring and evaluation of
573 existing activities or understanding of what happens to the data that has been collected. By not having accurate data to
574 measure potential progress of the network’s primary goals (improving mortality rates and user experience) there was
575 less urgency among in-country actors to devote efforts in establishing the network.

576 *Political developments*

577 Country leadership commitment and prioritization of MNH and QI, as well broader developments within each
578 of the countries, also shaped the emergence of QCN. Across the four countries, QCN’s emergence was supported by
579 the network’s alignment with national priorities to improve quality of care, as reflected in national health sector plans,
580 as well as government efforts to make progress on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).[77–80] A respondent

581 from UNICEF described how these high-level government commitments were critical to QCN emergence in
582 Bangladesh:

583 “Government has recognized and prioritized this thing that quality is a must. It was told access alone
584 before but now access alone can’t reduce the preventable death. So quality of care is a must in there.
585 So there is no alternative of quality of care to achieve sustainable development goal by 2030. The
586 Government understands this very well and they are also committed for this.”
587

588 In Bangladesh, QCN’s emergence was also supported by the Prime Minister’s signature in a charter of the United
589 Nations in 2014 and prioritization of community-level care. In Ethiopia, strong alignment between the country’s health
590 sector strategic plan and the goal of QCN led the country to be seen as a QCN flagship.

591

592 Despite these high-level commitments, there were developments that posed challenges for QCN’s emergence.
593 In Ethiopia, the political reality remained that the health system struggled with low healthcare funding and high out-of-
594 pocket expenditure despite the implementation of several reforms in health care financing. Further, respondents in
595 Ethiopia described how the country’s historic political transition that began in 2018, as well as the displacement and
596 war in the country, which began in 2020—during the nascent period of QCN—hindered the network’s establishment
597 given barriers to freely move, coordinate, and implement the project in affected districts. In Uganda, respondents at the
598 facility level highlighted the negative influence of corruption on healthcare worker morale and the emergence of QCN.
599 They described how money never trickled down to them while working on the frontline, leading to reduced dedication
600 to work and absenteeism—both obstructive characteristics for establishing a learning and implementation network
601 around quality improvement. In Malawi, respondents described an inability to prioritize MNH improvement given
602 inadequate funding and frequent budget cuts to the health sector. A respondent from a non-governmental organization
603 described how this was not conducive to QCN emergence in the country:

604 “There's so many constraints...A lot of things have to change and at the moment the structure doesn't
605 allow for that and the political will also doesn't allow for that because every year you find budgets are
606 being cut to the district so how do you expect a district to actually improve services and yet politically you
607 are not committing to that? ”
608

609 *Network Features*

610 Factors concerning a country’s policy environment helped explain the extent and speed of QCN’s crystallization
611 across various countries. However, features of the network itself—specifically, its governance structure and
612 leadership—were also just as crucial in explaining QCN’s emergence across countries.

613 *Governance*

614 QCN crystalized faster and with greater quality across the various levels of actors when QCN was embedded
615 in powerful national government agencies with previous experience directing QI initiatives and included donors and
616 implementing partners that had pre-existing QI initiatives and trusting relationships between involved actors at national
617 and sub-national levels.

618
619 In Bangladesh, the strategic placement and integration of QCN activities into Bangladesh’s QIS—a strong and
620 well-established government agency at the center of the country’s quality improvement efforts— helped accelerate the
621 network’s emergence. Since 2015, QIS strengthened and coordinated quality improvement activities in the public and
622 private health sectors across the country; was responsible for setting quality standards and introducing QI improvement
623 procedures within medical facilities; and was involved in the development of key national quality plans such as the
624 National Quality Strategy for the health sector in 2015, and the fourth National Health Sector Plan (Health Population
625 and Nutrition Sector Program, 2017-2022). [81] QCN’s legitimacy was bolstered early on by having the network’s
626 leadership embedded in QIS, which was housed within the Health Economics Unit of the Ministry of Health and Family
627 Welfare. [82,83] QIS was initially briefly moved into the DGHS (before eventually returning to the MOHFW).
628 Respondents reported this move to be instrumental for QCN’s formation, given DGHS’s ability to harmonize
629 implementation and monitoring under a single roof. A respondent working at WHO in Bangladesh noted:

630
631 “Quality Secretariat has been shifted to the Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS). DGHS
632 has another unit of quality assurance. The [previous] gap that existed got reduced. Now quality
633 secretariat and quality assurance are working in the same section. As it is in DGHS, so it’s become
634 easier for development partners also to work with them all together directly.”
635

636 QCN was also embedded in the high-level decision workflows of implementing agencies that had a long history working
637 with government actors in Bangladesh. Specifically, pre-existing relationships between WHO, UNICEF, and Save the
638 Children with government actors were critical to QCN’s early formation and success. Each of these actors were

639 simultaneously engaged in QCN and engaged in in-country quality improvement programming. This dual participation
640 led to harmonization between network goals and existing national quality goals. Also, these international agencies and
641 implementing partners had significant reach in the country given pre-existing projects. For example, in the early stages
642 of QCN emergence in Bangladesh, UNICEF had a highly integrated, comprehensive quality improvement approach
643 that covered 119 facilities in 15 districts; the MaMoni MNCSP project worked in 17 districts, all of which have at least
644 some degree of quality improvement programming; and MaMoni/Save the Children worked in 179 facilities across 14
645 districts where MNCH quality improvement bundles were being implemented. Furthermore, QCN in Bangladesh
646 purposefully kept its membership open, actively recruiting all of the major quality-involved actors in the country early
647 on, including government, professional bodies, district health officials, and health facility administrators. In particular,
648 engagement with motivated and engaged frontline health workers strengthened the network's foundations and enabled
649 its intended outputs to diffuse through the Bangladesh national health care system.

650 In Ethiopia, QCN was also embedded in a strong national government agency: the Federal Ministry of Health
651 of Ethiopia, which played a significant role in setting goals, developing a roadmap and guidelines, and facilitating the
652 implementation of the network in the selected facilities, with the support of implementing partners. Like Bangladesh,
653 there was a strong quality management structure in Ethiopia that had existed since 2015, which helped foster QCN's
654 emergence. Coordination, recognition, commitment and supervision of QCN was reported by respondents to be strong
655 at the national level, especially as compared to the regional and local levels. Nonetheless, there were clear efforts to
656 adapt and include the regional levels in the early days of the network. A national-level respondent from Ethiopia noted:

657 "The national roadmap has undergone regional adaptation, particularly where the WHO regional
658 technical advisor was located, for example, in Oromia, Addis Ababa, Amhara, Dire Dawa, and Harar
659 regions. By doing so, they have also included it in the regional operational plan. Therefore, under the
660 leadership of the Ministry of Health, these partners follow a harmonized and similar approach to
661 implement the project."
662

663 However, unlike Bangladesh, QCN in Ethiopia was initially perceived to be a WHO initiative, which hindered the
664 network's initial expansion. One national-level respondent explained this impact on QCN formation:

665 "During the initial time, some partners thought this project was WHO's project and hesitated to
666 engage...Initially, there were a lot of challenges, like seeing the project as WHO's project. But
667 through time partners became well engaged, the technical working group started discussing the
668 agenda regularly, and finally, the ministry took it as a flagship initiative."
669

670 These initial perceptions also impacted QCN's formation at the sub-national level, where local respondents reported
671 that their knowledge about the network was very limited and that they perceived it to be a *"two-month campaign activity"*. In
672 Ethiopia, QCN formation was largely influenced by implementing partners—such as IHI, CHAI, WHO, Transform
673 HDR, and Transform PHCU—given that the Ministry of Health's facility selection was largely based on their existing
674 activities. Some respondents however noted some challenges with the facility selection, namely: those that were selected
675 did not have critical problems, and the political situation given the conflict limited the geographic reach of the network.
676 A regional respondent described how the selection was not representative of the country:

677 "The number of facilities is high but does not represent the country as a pilot study. Attempts to include both
678 agrarian & pastoralist areas were made. I don't think they are representative. Some regions were excluded,
679 Somali and Dire dawa. It is difficult to say that 48 out of 4,000 is representative. The selection criteria were not
680 clear and I think it followed the donor's interest."

681 In contrast, QCN in Uganda was initially embedded in and co-led by the government's Quality Assurance
682 Department and MCH department. This initially caused fragmentation in activities, given the different mandates and
683 visions of the two institutional leaders tasked to oversee QCN activities. This resulted in development partners filling
684 the void in the initial years, and little proactive QCN development. For example, the majority of involved partners
685 requested to join the network themselves, rather than being invited by the government, with exception to CHAI and
686 Makerere University School of Public Health. Those initially engaged in QCN were organizations or partners that were
687 already Ministry partners on MNH issues, which respondents noted as a weakness, given the lack of engagement with
688 other external actors, such as Village Health Teams (VHTs), parliamentarians, religious leaders, private providers, and
689 media. One respondent working at WHO noted a lack of community engagement in QCN's early period:

691 "We want to bring in cultural leaders and mothers to appreciate this whole concept of quality
692 improvement and their role because we are now running into the community aspect. We have also not
693 done well because right from the global level they designed for the community engagement was not
694 defined very well until recently. And even recently I think the documents coming out need to be
695 supportive by many of the processes that they have had before. There we have had to move slowly for
696 community engagement."

697 Several respondents noted that the lack of community engagement was purposeful; initially, Ministry of Health officials
698 did not believe facilities needed to be aware of the QCN as they were not participating in higher-level network meetings.

700 A government respondent explained:

701 "I don't think facilities were meant to be part of the Network. They actually don't even attend those quarterly
702 Network meetings when we have Quarterly calls with WHO they don't usually attend. When I think through

703 it though now, I think we should have those people as members of the Network so that they are consciously
704 aware that they are part of the Global Network.”
705
706 QCN’s slow emergence in Uganda was also partly attributed to the siloed and disjointed nature of interactions
707 among implementing partners in the country. Despite the WHO convening a WhatsApp group for MNH with the UN
708 agencies in Uganda, including UNFPA and UNICEF, many of these agencies and other partners worked independently,
709 given different mandates, regions of focus, and use of different tools. While there were attempts to have these partners
710 pool their resources at the national level for QCN activities, respondents reported partners resisted this with reported
711 suspicion around how these resources will be utilized by the Ministry of Health. Consequently, funding and
712 implementation of activities at the national level was initially largely divided by partner, with different partners
713 overseeing various numbers of districts across the country. Respondents described the allocations to be based on
714 previous or ongoing partner work, rather than being intentionally assigned or coordinated. Furthermore, partners were
715 given a high level of autonomy in terms of where, how and what they decided to implement. This lack of clarity and
716 coordination among key network actors, in addition to a lack of trust among those involved, hampered the network’s
717 emergence, as well as its subsequent effectiveness. [31] Respondents in Uganda shared that its lack of communication
718 with the global level, outside of few individuals within the Ministry of Health and WHO in Kampala, was partly driven
719 by the perception that the country was being judged against the other network countries without sufficient support to
720 succeed, despite having a shared desire to do so. Similarly, there was a lack of communication with the facility-level,
721 which had little awareness of QCN’s existence. A government respondent explained:
722 “And then when it comes to the facilities, we don’t even talk about Networks, but we talk to them
723 about quality of care for MNCH because they might not even understand the Network because they
724 are not members of the Network. It is the national level partners that are members of the Network, so
725 the facilities might not be aware when one mentions that they are one of the 10 countries participating
726 in this global Network for MNCH Quality of Care.”
727
728 It was not until 2019, when the Department of Quality Assurance was renamed to the Standards Compliance
729 Accreditation Patient Protection (SCAPP) under the Directorate of Governance and Regulation, and it was assigned
730 sole oversight and appointed a focal person for QCN, that the network began to emerge in Uganda. This new
731 arrangement enabled SCAPP to bring more partners and funding on board, and work better with other departments
732 in coordinating and implementing QCN activities.

733 In Malawi, the QCN was integrated into the Quality Management Directorate (QMD), which was established
734 in the Ministry of Health and Population in November 2016 to provide strategic leadership and coordinate quality
735 management and improvement initiatives cross the health sector. [84] Just prior to the launch of QCN, QMD had
736 established quality management structures within health facilities to improve quality of care. These structures, which
737 included quality management focal persons (e.g., district and facility level), a technical working group, quality
738 improvement support teams, and work improvement support teams, were likely to help facilitate QCN’s eventual
739 emergence in Malawi. A government respondent noted:

740 “They [QCN] are using the structures which the ministry or the quality management department has
741 laid to guide the quality of care as a country... We don’t have like specific structures for quality of care
742 network; we use the existing structures from the ministry through the quality management
743 department.”
744

745 Despite these facilitators, several governance factors contributed to QCN’s slow and fragmented emergence in Malawi.
746 First, the planning, development and dissemination of strategic documents at the national level was slow, as reported
747 by multiple involved respondents. For example, the formulation of strategic documents, including the QCN roadmap
748 and adoption of quality of care standards took almost two years to complete. Learning facilities described receiving the
749 standards and other important strategic documents, including the terms of reference for implementing structures (e.g.,
750 QIST, WITs and Ombudsmen) around early to mid 2019, leaving QI teams unaware of their roles and responsibilities
751 prior to this. Second, there were irregular QCN coordinating meetings and even periods of complete inactivity. Several
752 respondents working at the local level noted this:

753 “Sometimes meetings are very sporadic but we need to meet regularly and discuss.”
754

755 “We are supposed to be meeting quarterly but as I have told you it’s been a long time.”
756

757 This contributed to QCN members not having clear direction, as reported by a local level respondent:

758 “For the first two years of the quality of care network, mostly there was no clear direction about
759 what is supposed to be achieved... We were aware of the goal that is before us, but in terms of
760 [now saying] let us plan, these are the activities that should happen,' one, and two; 'what are the
761 targets that we are should give for each specific learning site?' and then 'what are the activities that
762 we can do to implement it. So, I think we hadn't made a lot of progress.”
763

764 Finally, like the other countries, there was disproportionate attention on QCN structures at the national level, as
765 compared to the district and local levels. For example, respondents at the national level, such as this respondent

766 interviewed in round one, described the lack of engagement of leaders at the local level as compared to the national
767 level:

768 “I would say would be doing better at the top but down there we really need to focus on the leadership to make
769 sure that we have the right people, we orient the people, we support them so that they are able to take up that
770 leadership role to lead the network at grass root. There I feel we can do better. In terms of action also I think
771 if we improve maybe the leadership, the action also we can improve in terms of support.”
772

773 *Leadership*

774 Effective leadership was also crucial to bringing relevant actors across QCN together and in guiding them to
775 effective collective action. In Bangladesh, several respondents working in multiple UN agencies highlighted the effective
776 leadership of the former DGHS Director for Hospitals and QIS point person, as a crucial driver of a variety of quality
777 activities, including QCN’s formation and initial success:

779 “He is the driving force. He has brought it [QCN and the agenda of quality improvement] forward”
780 Implementing partner-National-Bangladesh-Round 1
781
782

783 Respondents also noted another well-respected champion that was crucial to QCN emergence, given his long history
784 of improving healthcare in Bangladesh. Specifically, this champion implemented the Chowgacha to Jhenaidah Model (CJ
785 Model), which led to improvement of hospital services and resources for underserved people. Between 1996 and 2012,
786 upazila level standard services were developed under his leadership in the Chowgacha Health Complex of Jessore
787 (southwestern district of Bangladesh) and 46 additional workers from the community were mobilised. The Chowgacha
788 Health complex was subsequently awarded best performance in emergency obstetric care in the administrative division
789 consecutively between 2005 and 2014. One respondent working at the local level noted this champion’s ability to build
790 community trust and buy-in for quality improvement:

791 “[He] has extracted these things like how to synchronise this quality from upazilla to district level. How to
792 improve the health system quality in an upazilla through normal situation. He has been able to make a financial
793 and social bonding regarding that issue. He has been ensured 100% people’s involvement of that area. If it’s
794 possible to run all the upazilla and district hospitals in accordance with that model so that the people can enjoy
795 100% service.”
796
797

798 Another respondent working at the national level noted the significance of his efforts at both national and global levels:
799 “The initiatives taken by [this particular champion] are not only nationally, but also internationally
800 appreciated. The foreign delegate of UNICEF went [to see the model]. [It was] also [recognized]
801 nationwide [by the] Prime Minister.”
802

803 In contrast, there was initially no clear focal person in Ethiopia, as noted by several national-level respondents, which
804 may have slowed QCN's emergence in the country:

805 "Since the directorate was not strengthened and there was no MNH quality of care focal person in
806 the directorate, the technical assistant was performing those tasks. Somehow it was good but this
807 created some gap" XXX-National-Ethiopia Round 1
808

809 This was also the case in Uganda, with leadership capacity largely varying across the six districts that were selected
810 to participate. Respondents noted that leadership at these levels were not well empowered or unsupportive. In Malawi,
811 respondents described poor leadership shaping the network's emergence. Respondents especially highlighted leadership
812 difficulties at lower levels, with individuals in leadership positions failing to lead by example and unclear leadership
813 structures. One local-level respondent noted:

814 "Another challenge that we are facing is leadership. When I say leadership, I don't mean the DMHD and
815 the other topmost leaders because they know why they are there... but within our teams, within our
816 health facilities... You cannot differentiate who is on top and who is subordinate... So all these are the
817 things we consider simple are the things that are highly contributing into negatively results."
818

819 **Discussion**

820
821 Across the four countries examined, there were multiple factors that posed significant challenges to QCN
822 emergence. These included a lack of skilled professionals, inadequate infrastructure, and lacking or unsustainable
823 funding for quality of care and MNH initiatives and programs. However, all four countries also possessed favorable
824 dynamics for QCN emergence—the reason they were selected as pathfinding countries by WHO and global
825 implementing partners, including: existing programs and policies that advanced quality of care and MNH improvement,
826 political commitment to SDG3 and universal health coverage, and in-country presence of non-governmental partners
827 also part of QCN global leadership. Nonetheless, QCN emerged more rapidly and to a greater extent in Bangladesh,
828 followed by Ethiopia, Uganda, then Malawi.

829 Factors connected to the policy environment and network features explained variance in network emergence.
830 With respect to the policy environment, pre-existing resources and initiatives dedicated to MNH and QI, strong data
831 and health system capacity and alignment, and national commitment and advancement on synergistic goals—beyond
832 the primary aims of the network—were crucial drivers to QCN's emergence. With respect to the features of the network
833 itself, the embedding of QCN leadership in powerful agencies with established coordination structures and trusting

834 relationships with key stakeholders, as well as effective leadership —at various levels—were also just as crucial in
835 explaining the strength of QCN’s emergence across countries.

836 Three strategic considerations are gleaned from this analysis for improving network establishment. The first
837 concerns the nature of the relationships between global and national stakeholders before and during the early days of
838 establishing a network. It is especially critical for global actors to have pre-existing and trusting relationships with
839 national and local leaders. [85–87] This highlights a deeper point: pathfinder countries for QCN—like many global
840 health and development initiatives—are purposefully selected by global development actors given their perceived
841 favorable environment and the partner’s existing relationships and presence in-country. These countries, the so called
842 “aid darlings”, [88] which attract the investments of a wide variety of funders and development partners, are naturally
843 more likely to produce cohesive and strong mechanisms over time that facilitate effective coordination and strengthen
844 existing relationships among in-country and foreign partners. This presents an inherent tension for global health
845 development partners: pursue policy environments that are most suitable in order to have the best odds of getting the
846 network off the ground or pursue contexts with the most major challenges that are most in need of the network. The
847 former is more likely to increase inequality; the latter is more likely to fail completely.

848 Second, networks are more likely to emerge when country actors are engaged early on and they feel invested in
849 the work of the proposed network. This is especially the case when considering the engagement and morale of street
850 level bureaucrats—“the public service workers that interact directly with citizens in the course of their jobs and who
851 have substantial discretion in the execution of their work”[89]—part of the network. Networks crystalize more robustly
852 when these local actors exhibit high levels of morale and motivation and they are made aware of their roles and potential
853 impacts early on. This occurred clearly with QCN in Bangladesh, where local stakeholders—particularly local healthcare
854 providers—perceived themselves as pioneers of the network, rather than solely self-describing as beneficiaries of
855 network activities, or perceiving them as burdensome. Strong established systems of governance and data collection
856 were critical to fostering this engagement between stakeholders at the local, national and global levels, which provided
857 mechanisms for coordination and communication, accountability, and continuity between actors and programs.

858 Third, network emergence requires strong focal leadership, both in terms of individuals and institutions, that
859 pre-exist the network. Networks are more likely to robustly emerge in countries where institutional leadership is

860 embedded in a strong governmental agency that has pre-existing experience leading and coordinating related activities.
861 In Bangladesh and Ethiopia, QCN was embedded in a strong and experienced quality improvement management
862 structure that pre-dated QCN and was housed in a strong Ministry. In contrast, Uganda faced considerable difficulty in
863 identifying an appropriate and capable institution to embed QCN national activities in its early days. These experiences
864 shaped the nature of interactions and extent of coordination among involved national and level stakeholders in the early
865 days of the network's establishment. Furthermore, the presence of charismatic and respected in-country champions is
866 especially crucial in bringing actors together and giving the network legitimacy. [29] In Bangladesh, the buy-in and
867 involvement of several nationally-recognized quality improvement champions gave QCN immediate credibility within
868 the country, contributing to the relatively fast uptake of network activities.

869 This study has several key strengths. The first is its comparative design. While there are exceptions, [44,90]
870 most studies examining global health networks or global health partnerships are single case studies that examine the
871 governance, evolution or impacts of these entities at the global level or within one country context. While important,
872 these studies are limited in their generalizability; it is only through a comparison of one network or partnership across
873 multiple countries that one can one gain in-depth insights (internal validity), as well as generalizability beyond the cases
874 examined (external validity). The second strength lies in the rigor and depth of the data collection and analysis. Multiple
875 types of data (including literature, key-informant interviews, and observation) were triangulated to ensure accuracy.
876 Finally, the subject of this study— network emergence—has largely been under-studied, especially as compared to the
877 function, impact and effectiveness of networks in global health. [3,6,35,91–93] The primary limitation of this study
878 concerns the difficulty with operationalizing and detecting network emergence, especially given the prospective nature
879 in which the data for this study was collected—shortly after the time that QCN was conceptualized at the global level,
880 and during the time in which these networks were beginning to take shape in pathfinder countries. Also, given the
881 relative dearth of research on network emergence, the theory that we drew on to examine network emergence was
882 largely developed for examining global networks, rather than in-country networks. While we tried to account for this by
883 also drawing on the global health partnership scholarship, there may be national and local level dynamics that may have
884 been missed in probing the factors shaping network emergence in these contexts. Future research on this subject should
885 expand to examining emergence of QCN in other pathfinder countries retrospectively, building on what has been

886 gleaned from this study. In particular, these studies could examine identified network strengths, such as country
887 leadership for the issue more in-depth. For example, what are the characteristics of effective leadership that can foster
888 network emergence? In the same way, future studies should focus on how to overcome identified weaknesses, which
889 obstruct network emergence. For example, what strategies may be utilized to overcome inherent trust deficiencies
890 among state actors at various levels, and external implementing partners and funders?

891

892

Conclusion

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

The findings are not only relevant for improving QCN emergence and subsequent activities in other countries, but also in making multi-country networks for other issues in global health—especially at the earliest stages—more successful. This is especially critical given the growing role over the last two decades that global health networks and partnerships have played in global health.[94] These include and are not limited to The Partnership for Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health, Stop TB, the GAVI Alliance, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. These networks are central to providing technical assistance and capacity support, engaging in advocacy, and providing financing. They also play pivotal roles in making in-country progress on the Sustainable Development Goals and improving health system function in LMICs.

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

The factors identified—both relating to the policy environment and the nature of the network—not only shape the speed and way networks are established, but also have implications for the network’s perceived legitimacy[29] and the trajectory of the network’s later development and effectiveness.[31] By understanding a network’s emergence, practitioners may be in a better position to predict future outcomes, and also more effectively strategize accordingly to minimize or resolve less than favorable developments at the inception phase, in order to achieve long-term success. In addition to these practical contributions, this analysis adds to the theoretical scholarship on network emergence, which is a significantly smaller body of scholarship as compared to that examining network effectiveness in global health. The analysis highlights that QCN’s emergence lies on a spectrum, and identifies the crucial role that strategies and actions of members involved in the network, as well as the policy environment that they operate in, played in explaining network emergence variance across four pathfinding countries.

911

912

913

914 **Acknowledgments**

915 We thank all respondents and stakeholders for their time and contributions toward making this work possible. The
916 QCN Evaluation Group is: Nehla Djellouli, Kasonde Mwaba, Callie Daniels-Howell, Tim Colbourn (UCL Institute
917 for Global Health, UK), Kohenour Akter, Fatama Khatun, Mithun Sarker, Abdul Kuddus, Kishwar Azad (BADAS-
918 PCP Bangladesh), Kondwani Mwandira, Albert Dube, Gladson Monjeza, Rachel Magaletta, Zabvuta Moffolo, Charles
919 Makwenda (Parent and Child Health Initiative, Malawi), Mary Kinney, Fidele Mukinda (independent researchers,
920 South Africa), Mike English (Oxford University), Yusra Shawar, Will Payne, Jeremy Shiffman (Johns Hopkins
921 University, USA), Kathy Lubowa, Agnes Kyamulabi, Hilda Namakula, Gloria Seruwagi (Makerere University,
922 Uganda), Anene Tesfa, Asebe Amenu, Theodros Getachew, Geremew Gonfa (Ethiopia Public Health Institute,
923 Ethiopia), Seblewengel Lemma, Tanya Marchant (LSHTM, UK)

924
925

926

References

927

- 928 1. Shiffman J, Quissell K, Schmitz HP, Pelletier DL, Smith SL, Berlan D, et al. A framework on the emergence and
929 effectiveness of global health networks. *Health Policy Plan.* 2016;31 Suppl 1: i3–16.
- 930 2. Shiffman J. Four Challenges That Global Health Networks Face. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2017;6: 183–189.
- 931 3. Smith SL, Rodriguez MA. Agenda setting for maternal survival: the power of global health networks and norms.
932 *Health Policy Plan.* 2016;31 Suppl 1: i48–59.
- 933 4. Dalglish SL, George A, Shearer JC, Bennett S. Epistemic communities in global health and the development of
934 child survival policy: a case study of iCCM. *Health Policy Plan.* 2015;30 Suppl 2: ii12–ii25.
- 935 5. Shawar YR, Shiffman J, Spiegel DA. Generation of political priority for global surgery: a qualitative policy
936 analysis. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2015;3: e487–e495.
- 937 6. Shawar YR, Crane LG. Generating global political priority for urban health: the role of the urban health
938 epistemic community. *Health Policy Plan.* 2017;32: 1229.
- 939 7. Quissell K, Walt G. The challenge of sustaining effectiveness over time: the case of the global network to stop
940 tuberculosis. *Health Policy and Planning.* 2016. pp. i17–i32. doi:10.1093/heapol/czv035
- 941 8. Hesselmann E. The Limits of Control: The Accountability of Foundations and Partnerships in Global Health.
942 In: Rushton S, Williams OD, editors. *Partnerships and Foundations in Global Health Governance.* London:
943 Palgrave Macmillan UK; 2011. pp. 228–252.
- 944 9. Reinicke WH. The Other World Wide Web: Global Public Policy Networks. *Foreign Policy.* 1999; 44–57.
- 945 10. Haas PM. Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *Int Organ.* 1992.
946 Available: [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization/article/introduction-epistemic-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization/article/introduction-epistemic-communities-and-international-policy-coordination/CE9CFC049E0F2A14635F1E3EB51960C9)
947 [communities-and-international-policy-coordination/CE9CFC049E0F2A14635F1E3EB51960C9](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-organization/article/introduction-epistemic-communities-and-international-policy-coordination/CE9CFC049E0F2A14635F1E3EB51960C9)
- 948 11. Keck ME, Sikkink K. Transnational advocacy networks in the movement society. *The social movement society:*
949 *Contentious politics for a new century.* 1998; 217–238.
- 950 12. Shawar YR, Shiffman J. A global priority: addressing violence against children. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2021.
951 Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc8164181/>
- 952 13. Shawar YR, Shiffman J. Generating Global Priority for Addressing Rheumatic Heart Disease: A Qualitative
953 Policy Analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2020;9: e014800.
- 954 14. Berry FS, Brower RS, Choi SO, Goa WX, Jang H, Kwon M, et al. Three traditions of network research: What
955 the public management research agenda can learn from other research communities. *Public Adm Rev.* 2004;64:
956 539–552.
- 957 15. Quissell K, Berlan D, Shiffman J, Walt G. Explaining global network emergence and nonemergence: Comparing
958 the processes of network formation for tuberculosis and pneumonia. *Public Administration and Development.*
959 2018. pp. 144–153. doi:10.1002/pad.1836
- 960 16. Provan KG, Fish A, Sydow J. Interorganizational Networks at the Network Level: A Review of the Empirical
961 Literature on Whole Networks. *J Manage.* 2007;33: 479–516.

- 962 17. Wachhaus TA. Anarchy as a model for network governance. *Public Adm Rev.* 2012;72: 33–42.
- 963 18. Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health.. [cited 11 Jan 2023]. Available:
964 <https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/about>
- 965 19. The network for improving quality of care for maternal, newborn and child health: evolution, implementation
966 and progress. 2017 – 2020 report. World Health Organization; 2021.
- 967 20. van den Broek NR, Graham WJ. Quality of care for maternal and newborn health: the neglected agenda. *BJOG.*
968 2009;116 Suppl 1: 18–21.
- 969 21. Spicer N, Agyepong I, Ottersen T, Jahn A, Ooms G. “It’s far too complicated’: why fragmentation persists in
970 global health. *Global Health.* 2020;16: 60.
- 971 22. Goldstein J. Emergence as a Construct: History and Issues. *Emergence.* 1999. pp. 49–72.
972 doi:10.1207/s15327000em0101_4
- 973 23. Gibb S, Hendry RF, Lancaster T. *The Routledge Handbook of Emergence.* Routledge; 2019.
- 974 24. Winning J, Bechtel W. Being Emergence Vs. Pattern Emergence: Complexity, Control, and Goal-Directedness in
975 Biological Systems. In: Gibb S, Hendry R, Lancaster T, editors. *The Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of*
976 *Emergence.* 2019. pp. 134–144.
- 977 25. Halley JD, Winkler DA. Classification of emergence and its relation to self-organization. *Complexity.* 2008. pp.
978 10–15. doi:10.1002/cplx.20216
- 979 26. Ryan AJ. Emergence is coupled to scope, not level. *Complexity.* 2007;13: 67–77.
- 980 27. Kozlowski SWJ, Chao GT, Grand JA, Braun MT, Kuljanin G. Advancing Multilevel Research Design.
981 *Organizational Research Methods.* 2013. pp. 581–615. doi:10.1177/1094428113493119
- 982 28. Corning PA. The re-emergence of ‘emergence’: A venerable concept in search of a theory. *Complexity.* 2002;7:
983 18–30.
- 984 29. Kohenour Akter, Yusra Ribhi Shawar, Anene Tesfa, Callie Daniels-Howell, Gloria Seruwagi, Agnes Kyamulabi,
985 Albert Dube, Geremew Gonfa, Kasonde Mwaba ... QCN Evaluation Group, Mary Kinney, Mike English,
986 Jeremy Shiffman, Nehla Djellouli, Tim Colbourn. Influences on policy-formulation, decision-making,
987 organisation and management for maternal, newborn and child health in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and
988 Uganda: the roles and legitimacy of a multi-country network.
- 989 30. Fidele Kanyimbu Mukinda, Nehla Djellouli, Kohenour Akter, Mithun Sarker, Asebe Amenu Tufa, Kondwani
990 Mwandira, Gloria Seruwagi, Agnes Kyamulabi, Kasonde Mwaba, Tanya Marchant, Yusra Shawar, Mike English,
991 Hilda Namakula, Catherine Nakidde, Geremew Gonfa, . . . , QCN Evaluation Group, Tim Colbourn, Mary
992 Kinney. Individual and organisational interactions, learning and information sharing in a multi-country
993 implementation-focused quality of care network for maternal, newborn and child health: a stakeholder network
994 analysis.
- 995 31. Nehla Djellouli Yusra Ribhi Shawar, Kasonde Mwaba, Kohenour Akter, Gloria Seruwagi, Asebe Amenu Tufa,
996 Geremew Gonfa, Kondwani Mwandira, QCN Evaluation Group, Jeremy Shiffman, Mike English, Tim
997 Colbourn. Effectiveness of a multi-country implementation-focused network on quality of care: delivery of
998 interventions and processes for improved maternal, newborn and child health outcomes.
- 999 32. UNICEF. Every Mother Every Newborn (EMEN) Quality Improvement Guide for Health Facility Staff Guide.
1000 In: Healthy Newborn Network [Internet]. Available: <https://www.healthynewbornnetwork.org/hnn->

- 1001 content/uploads/EMEN-QI-GUIDE-.pdf
- 1002 33. World Health Organization. STANDARDS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY OF MATERNAL AND
1003 NEWBORN CARE IN HEALTH FACILITIES. World Health Organization; 2017. Available:
1004 [https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/mca-documents/qoc/quality-of-care/standards-for-](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/mca-documents/qoc/quality-of-care/standards-for-improving-quality-of-maternal-and-newborn-care-in-health-facilities.pdf)
1005 [improving-quality-of-maternal-and-newborn-care-in-health-facilities.pdf](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/mca-documents/qoc/quality-of-care/standards-for-improving-quality-of-maternal-and-newborn-care-in-health-facilities.pdf)
- 1006 34. The network for improving quality of care for maternal, newborn and child health: evolution, implementation
1007 and progress. 2017 – 2020 report. Action for quality: a brief on progress and learning from implementation.
1008 World Health Organization; 2021.
- 1009 35. Shawar YR, Shiffman J. Political challenges to prioritizing gender in global health organisations. *J Glob Health*.
1010 2020;10: 010702.
- 1011 36. Tomlinson M, Lund C. Why does mental health not get the attention it deserves? An application of the Shiffman
1012 and Smith framework. *PLoS Med*. 2012;9: e1001178.
- 1013 37. Launch of the network for improving quality of care for maternal, newborn and child health. [cited 21 Oct 2022].
1014 Available: [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/launch-of-the-network-for-improving-quality-of-care-for-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/launch-of-the-network-for-improving-quality-of-care-for-maternal-newborn-and-child-health)
1015 [maternal-newborn-and-child-health](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/launch-of-the-network-for-improving-quality-of-care-for-maternal-newborn-and-child-health)
- 1016 38. Quality, equity, dignity: the network to improve quality of care for maternal, newborn and child health – strategic
1017 objectives. World Health Organization; 27 Jan 2018 [cited 21 Oct 2022]. Available:
1018 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241513951>
- 1019 39. Health Organization W. Quality, equity, dignity: the network to improve quality of care for maternal, newborn
1020 and child health -strategic objectives. [cited 21 Oct 2022]. Available:
1021 <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/272612/9789241513951-eng.pdf>
- 1022 40. Adeniran A, Likaka A, Knutsson A, Costello A, Daelmans B, Maliqi B, et al. Leadership, action, learning and
1023 accountability to deliver quality care for women, newborns and children. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2018;96:
1024 222–224.
- 1025 41. Report of the second global meeting of the Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and
1026 Child Health in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, March 2019. [cited 21 Oct 2022]. Available:
1027 [https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/knowledge-library/report-second-global-meeting-network-improving-](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/knowledge-library/report-second-global-meeting-network-improving-quality-care-maternal-newborn-and)
1028 [quality-care-maternal-newborn-and](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/knowledge-library/report-second-global-meeting-network-improving-quality-care-maternal-newborn-and)
- 1029 42. The network for improving quality of care for maternal, newborn and child health: evolution, implementation
1030 and progress: 2017-2020 report. World Health Organization; 5 May 2021 [cited 11 Jan 2023]. Available:
1031 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240023741>
- 1032 43. Steenhoff AP, Crouse HL, Lukolyo H, Larson CP, Howard C, Mazhani L, et al. Partnerships for Global Child
1033 Health. *Pediatrics*. 2017;140. doi:10.1542/peds.2016-3823
- 1034 44. Plamondon KM, Brisbois B, Dubent L, Larson CP. Assessing how global health partnerships function: an
1035 equity-informed critical interpretive synthesis. *Global Health*. 2021;17: 73.
- 1036 45. Provan KG, Kenis P. Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness. *J Public Adm*
1037 *Res Theory*. 2007;18: 229–252.
- 1038 46. Ferlie E, Fitzgerald L, McGivern G. Public policy networks and “wicked problems”: a nascent solution? *Public*.
1039 2011. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467->

- 1040 9299.2010.01896.x?casa_token=q5bkNcbwXFYAAAAA:S1PNr4AjlM-
1041 r7x3InhccinCgWDPI7b2qZKveQ8vOn1z8oGZt2ITy7rW_Qpt8ys_pvpOzokJetu5M3g
- 1042 47. Provan KG, Milward HB. A Preliminary Theory of Interorganizational Network Effectiveness: A Comparative
1043 Study of Four Community Mental Health Systems. *Adm Sci Q.* 1995;40: 1–33.
- 1044 48. Nzinga J, McGivern G, English M. Examining clinical leadership in Kenyan public hospitals through the
1045 distributed leadership lens. *Health Policy Plan.* 2018;33: ii27–ii34.
- 1046 49. McGivern G, Nzinga J, English M. “Pastoral practices” for quality improvement in a Kenyan clinical network.
1047 *Soc Sci Med.* 2017;195: 115–122.
- 1048 50. Gerring J. What is a case study and what is it good for? *Am Polit Sci Rev.* 2004;98: 341–354.
- 1049 51. Beach D, Pedersen RB. *Process-tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines.* University of Michigan Press;
1050 2019.
- 1051 52. Patton MQ. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice.* SAGE Publications;
1052 2014.
- 1053 53. Olivier de Sardan J-P, Diarra A, Moha M. Travelling models and the challenge of pragmatic contexts and
1054 practical norms: the case of maternal health. *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2017;15: 60.
- 1055 54. Lipsky M. *Street-Level Bureaucracy, 30th Anniversary Edition: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service.*
1056 Russell Sage Foundation; 2010.
- 1057 55. Mookherji S, LaFond A. Strategies to maximize generalization from multiple case studies: Lessons from the
1058 Africa Routine Immunization System Essentials (ARISE) project. *Evaluation.* 2013;19: 284–303.
- 1059 56. Shiffman J, Schmitz HP, Berlan D, Smith SL, Quissell K, Gneiting U, et al. The emergence and effectiveness of
1060 global health networks: findings and future research. *Health Policy Plan.* 2016;31 Suppl 1: i110–23.
- 1061 57. Bengtsson M. How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open.* 2016;2: 8–
1062 14.
- 1063 58. Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and
1064 measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Educ Today.* 2004;24: 105–112.
- 1065 59. Berg BL, Lune H. *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences 8th Ed.* Pearson Education, Inc., United
1066 States; 2012.
- 1067 60. Burnard P. A method of analysing interview transcripts in qualitative research. *Nurse Educ Today.* 1991;11: 461–
1068 466.
- 1069 61. Bangladesh. [cited 11 Jan 2023]. Available: <https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/country-data/bangladesh>
- 1070 62. Billah SM, Chowdhury MAK, Khan ANS, Karim F, Hassan A, Zaka N, et al. Quality of care during childbirth at
1071 public health facilities in Bangladesh: a cross-sectional study using WHO/UNICEF “Every Mother Every
1072 Newborn (EMEN)” standards. *BMJ Open Qual.* 2019;8: e000596.
- 1073 63. Maternal Health Program, Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS), Government of the People’s
1074 Republic of Bangladesh. *Maternal and Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response (MPDSR) in Bangladesh:
1075 Progress and Highlights in 2020.* 2021 Jan. Available: [https://bangladesh.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-
1076 pdf/mpdsr_annual_report_2020_final.pdf](https://bangladesh.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/mpdsr_annual_report_2020_final.pdf)

- 1077 64. Mamoni - Home Page. [cited 21 Oct 2022]. Available: <https://mamoni.info>
- 1078 65. To C. Countdown to 2015: Maternal, Newborn and Child Survival. Ethiopia. 2015. Available:
1079 http://countdown2030.org/documents/2015Report/Ethiopia_2015.pdf
- 1080 66. Central Statistical Agency and ICF. Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey. 2016.
- 1081 67. Ethiopia FMH. Health sector transformation plan I. Addis Ababa.
- 1082 68. Ministé EY ጥቅታ. Ethiopian National Health Care Quality Strategy, 2016–2020: Transforming the Quality of
1083 Health Care in Ethiopia. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health; 2016.
- 1084 69. Quality of care network updates - February 2018. [cited 21 Oct 2022]. Available:
1085 <https://mailchi.mp/2a54d521ee8f/quality-of-care-network-updates-february-2018>
- 1086 70. The Republic of Uganda. Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health Sharpened Plan for
1087 Uganda 2016/17 – 2019/20. 2016. Available: [https://www.health.go.ug/cause/reproductive-maternal-newborn-
1088 child-and-adolescent-sharpened-plan-for-uganda-2016-17-2019-20/](https://www.health.go.ug/cause/reproductive-maternal-newborn-child-and-adolescent-sharpened-plan-for-uganda-2016-17-2019-20/)
- 1089 71. Hagel C, Paton C, Mbevi G, English M, Clinical Information Network (CIN) information systems interest
1090 group. Data for tracking SDGs: challenges in capturing neonatal data from hospitals in Kenya. *BMJ Glob
1091 Health*. 2020;5: e002108.
- 1092 72. Haileamlak A. How Can Ethiopia Mitigate the Health Workforce Gap to Meet Universal Health Coverage?
1093 *Ethiop J Health Sci*. 2018;28: 249–250.
- 1094 73. Assefa T, Haile Mariam D, Mekonnen W, Derbew M. Health system’s response for physician workforce
1095 shortages and the upcoming crisis in Ethiopia: a grounded theory research. *Hum Resour Health*. 2017;15: 86.
- 1096 74. Dejene D, Yigzaw T, Mengistu S, Ayalew F, Kahsaye M, Woldemariam D. Exploring health workforce
1097 regulation practices and gaps in Ethiopia: a national cross-sectional study. *Glob Health Res Policy*. 2019;4: 36.
- 1098 75. Magge H, Kiflie A, Nimako K, Brooks K, Sodzi-Tettey S, Mobisson-Etuk N, et al. The Ethiopia healthcare
1099 quality initiative: design and initial lessons learned. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2019;31: G180–G186.
- 1100 76. Mleme T, Kaludzu E, Chimbalanga E, Mitambo C, Sakala M. Data Quality in Malawi’s Health Information
1101 System: A Qualitative Perspective. March-June 2017. Available:
1102 [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a0db9d229f18771e961fc89/t/5ae3498888251bba5f5dc9ca/1524844936
1103 353/NEP+MW+DQA+Qual+Report_EMAIL_18+Jul.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a0db9d229f18771e961fc89/t/5ae3498888251bba5f5dc9ca/1524844936353/NEP+MW+DQA+Qual+Report_EMAIL_18+Jul.pdf)
- 1104 77. Joarder T, Chaudhury TZ, Mannan I. Universal Health Coverage in Bangladesh: Activities, Challenges, and
1105 Suggestions. *Psyche*. 2019;2019: 4954095.
- 1106 78. Twea P, Manthalu G, Mohan S. Allocating resources to support universal health coverage: policy processes and
1107 implementation in Malawi. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020;5. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002766
- 1108 79. Tashobya CK, Ogora VA, Kiwanuka SN, Mutebi A, Musila T, Byakika S, et al. Universal Health Coverage in
1109 Uganda: Looking Back and Forward to Speed up the Progress. Makerere University, Kampala Uganda. [cited 21
1110 Oct 2022]. Available: <http://speed.musph.ac.ug/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Chapter-6.pdf>
- 1111 80. Eregata GT, Hailu A, Memirie ST, Norheim OF. Measuring progress towards universal health coverage: national
1112 and subnational analysis in Ethiopia. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019;4: e001843.

- 1113 81. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Directorate General of Health
1114 Services, Health Service Division, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of the People's Republic
1115 of Bangladesh. 4th Health Population and Nutrition Sector Programme Operational Plan, Maternal Neonatal
1116 Child and Adolescent Health (MNC&AH) (January 2017 - June 2022). 2017.
- 1117 82. Begum T, Nababan H, Adams A, Ahmed A, Rahman A, Anwar I. Quality of maternal and neonatal health care:
1118 A cross sectional survey in the for-profit private sector facilities in urban Bangladesh. Research Square. 2020.
1119 doi:10.21203/rs.2.22885/v1
- 1120 83. QIS. History of Quality Improvement Secretariat (QIS). [cited 13 Jan 2023]. Available: [http://qis.gov.bd/wp-](http://qis.gov.bd/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/QIS-History.pdf)
1121 [content/uploads/2019/05/QIS-History.pdf](http://qis.gov.bd/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/QIS-History.pdf)
- 1122 84. User S. Quality Management. [cited 11 Jan 2023]. Available:
1123 <https://www.health.gov.mw/index.php/directorates/quality-management>
- 1124 85. Patnaik S, Pereira V, Temouri Y, Malik A, Roohanifar M. The dance of power and trust-exploring micro-
1125 foundational dimensions in the development of global health partnership. *Technol Forecast Soc Change*.
1126 2020;156: 120036.
- 1127 86. Ezezika OC. Building Trust: A Critical Component of Global Health. *Ann Glob Health*. 2015;81: 589–592.
- 1128 87. McNeill D, Sandberg KI. Trust in Global Health Governance: The GAVI Experience. *Global Governance*.
1129 2014;20: 325–343.
- 1130 88. Aid fragmentation and aid orphans - OECD. [cited 23 Mar 2023]. Available:
1131 <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/fragmentation-orphans.htm>
- 1132 89. Lipsky M. Toward a theory of street-level bureaucracy. Institute for Research on Poverty, University of
1133 Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin; 1969.
- 1134 90. Guilfoyle R, Morzycki AD, Saleh A. What makes global healthcare partnerships successful? A systematic review.
1135 *Glob Public Health*. 2022;17: 662–671.
- 1136 91. Gneiting U. From global agenda-setting to domestic implementation: successes and challenges of the global
1137 health network on tobacco control. *Health Policy Plan*. 2016;31 Suppl 1: i74–86.
- 1138 92. Storeng KT, Béhague DP. “Lives in the balance”: The politics of integration in the Partnership for Maternal,
1139 Newborn and Child Health. *Health Policy Plan*. 2016;31: 992–1000.
- 1140 93. Caines K, Buse K, Carlson C, De Loor R, Druce N, Grace C, et al. Assessing the impact of global health
1141 partnerships. Synthesis of findings from the. 2004. Available:
1142 [https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=85f9810cd82631e1136c1ee3e538a9f63120d](https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=85f9810cd82631e1136c1ee3e538a9f63120d417)
1143 417
- 1144 94. Rushton S, Williams O. Partnerships and Foundations in Global Health Governance. Springer; 2011.

1145

Figure 1: Timeline of QCN emergence at the global level



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.29.23287925>; this version posted March 31, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).