

1 **Title: "What slows the progress of health systems strengthening at subnational**
2 **level? A Political Economy Analysis of three districts in Uganda".**

3 **Short title: Health Systems Strengthening at subnational level in Uganda**

4 **Author list** Justine Namakula^{1*}, Xavier Nsabagasani¹, Ligia, Paina², Abigail, Neel²,
5 Chimwemwe Msukwa³, Daniela. C. Rodriguez², Freddie Ssenogooba¹

6

7 **Affiliations:**

8 ¹Department of Health Policy Planning and Management, School of Public Health,
9 Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

10 ²School of Public Health Johns, Hopkins University Bloomberg Baltimore, MD USA

11 ³UNICEF Country Office, Kampala, Uganda

12

13 Corresponding Author*

14 Email: jhasteen@yahoo.com(JN)

15

16 **Contribution of authors**

17 This study was a result of the collaboration between, JHU and Makerere University
18 JN, XN, LP, AN, CM, DCR, FS contributed to conceptualization, proposal, tool
19 development and identification of districts and interviewees. JN, XN, FS implemented
20 data collection. JN, XN, LP, AN, DCR, FS contributed to data abstraction and thematic
21 analysis. CM identified and organised opportunities for dissemination. JN, XN, FS
22 drafted the manuscript. LP, AN, DCR and CM provided feedback and input. All authors
23 have read and approved the final manuscript.

24 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

25

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 **Abstract**

27 There is increasing recognition that without stronger health systems, efforts to improve
28 global health and Universal Health Coverage cannot be achieved. Over the last three
29 decades, initiatives to strengthen health systems in low-income countries have
30 attracted huge investments in the context of achieving the Millennium Development
31 Goals, the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as Universal Health Coverage.
32 Yet, health system inadequacies persist, especially at the subnational level. Our paper
33 presents a political economy analysis featuring a three-district case study in Uganda,
34 where district-based health systems strengthening initiatives were implemented. The
35 study sought to understand why health systems at the subnational level are failing to
36 improve despite marked investments.

37

38 This problem-based political economy analysis draws from a document review and
39 key informant interviews [N=49] at the central and district levels with government
40 actors, development partners and civil society in three purposively selected districts.
41 Available financial data extraction and analysis were used to complement qualitative
42 data. We found that challenges in strengthening district health systems were
43 numerous. Themes related to financing and planning broadly interacted to curtail
44 progress on strengthening subnational level health systems. Specific challenges
45 included inadequate financing, mismatch of resources and targets, convoluted
46 financial flows, as well as unwieldy bureaucratic processes. Sticky issues related to
47 planning process-included variations in planning cycles, conflicting interests among
48 actors, insufficient community engagement, limited decision space, and distorted
49 accounting mechanisms.

50

51 In conclusion, the political economy analysis lens was a useful tool that enabled
52 understanding the dynamics of decision-making and resource allocation within district
53 health systems as well as the performance in terms of implementation of the district
54 work plans with existing resources. Whereas it is clear that the District health teams
55 play a big role in service program implementation, the context in which they work
56 needs to be improved in terms of sufficient resources, setting realistic targets,
57 widening the decision space and capacity necessary to engage with other various
58 stakeholders and effectively harmonize the implementation of the programs. Despite
59 playing a crucial role of compensating for local shortfalls in resources, donor resources
60 and engagements should not happen at the cost of the subnational voice in priority
61 setting and decision-making.

62

63 Key messages:

- 64 • The challenges for Health Systems Strengthening at the district level are
65 embedded in the structural reality as well as agency interests, power-relations,
66 and actions.
- 67 • Insufficient resources, delayed disbursement, and extreme conditional funding
68 undercut the effectiveness of health system planning, management,
69 performance, and accountability.
- 70 • Distorted accountability mechanisms and conflicting incentives among
71 subnational level actors limit district health stakeholders' decision space,
72 displace local priorities, and contribute to community engagement strategies
73 are not robust.

- 74 • Subnational level actors are alienated from the central and donor driven
75 priorities and decision-making and further constrained by bureaucracies.
76 Hence, their decision space needs amplification.
- 77 • Implementing partners should harmonize accounting and reporting
78 mechanisms and align them to the government systems.
- 79 • Bureaucracy related to resource allocation, financial flows, and decision-
80 making between central and district teams hinders timely implementation of
81 services.

82 Key words: health systems strengthening; Uganda; political economy; district health
83 systems; subnational level.

84

85 **Introduction**

86 There is widespread recognition that efforts to improve global health and to achieve
87 Universal Health Coverage (UHC) cannot be achieved without stronger health
88 systems (1). As a result, over the last three decades, Health Systems Strengthening
89 (HSS) in low-income countries has attracted many investments in the context of
90 achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the Sustainable Development
91 Goals (SDG), as well as UHC reforms (2). Yet, the goal for UHC – from “health for all
92 by 2000” to “UHC by 2030” – has eluded us for the last 30 years, as health system
93 inadequacy, especially at the subnational level, has persisted. In this context, both
94 national and global actors are concerned about sub-optimal returns on HSS
95 investments in terms of improving health system performance, resilience, and the
96 sustainability of the capacity thereof (3).

97 UHC can be defined in terms of health insurance coverage and as the basket of free-
98 of-charge services (4), but the HSS agenda underscores the role of UHC in ensuring
99 there is benefit to all people in a defined functional zone (3), giving priority to the district
100 and subnational efforts for health systems strengthening (5, 6). To achieve UHC
101 through Primary Health Care (PHC)-oriented health reforms, WHO established the
102 concept of district health systems aimed at creating a functional zone for planning and
103 implementation of PHC services at the subnational level (7, 8), enabled with in the
104 decentralization framework. This stimulated devolution and decentralization efforts
105 within the health system and renewed the need for decision-makers to understand the
106 interplay between national and subnational levels, the politics of resource allocation,
107 and the implications of health systems reform efforts on the services that the
108 population receives.

109

110 Despite the breadth of lessons learnt about health systems reforms and HSS, a lot
111 remains to be uncovered. Progress has been made on analyzing health systems
112 functions and performance through the core building blocks, health system process
113 elements and priority outcomes (7). More recently, the literature has focused
114 increasingly on the interactive nature of the health system blocks to generate new
115 understandings about interactivity, dynamism, and resilience (9-12). Although
116 acknowledged as important, less progress has been registered about the multiplicity
117 of actors interacting to oversee and deliver services, their power and interests, and
118 how these can be coordinated for common system goals(13, 14). Yet, these are major
119 challenges of multi-actor capabilities, governance, and institutional arrangements that
120 underpin health systems strengthening agendas.

121 In Uganda, decentralization was piloted in a few districts in 1993 as one of the
122 hallmarks of reforms to improve service delivery across all government programs in
123 Uganda(15). Later, in 1997, the national resistance movement passed a Local
124 Government Act 1997(16), later amended in 2001, 2005, and 2006 (15). The Local
125 government Act of 1997 provided a framework to rationalize the hierarchy of
126 decentralised administrative units from village to district level (15). Local governments
127 (LGs) hold the mandate for planning, spending and administration of programs for a
128 defined district or municipality(16). Like in many other countries, the LGs in Uganda
129 have healthcare and public health mandates and form the basic unit of a health system
130 at the subnational level (17). Over the years, district health systems have become an
131 essential locus for improving the health system to deliver PHC (18). Indeed,
132 international organizations such as the WHO and UNICEF have underscored a
133 renewed focus on PHC- as a vision and operational framework for achieving UHC
134 and sustainable development goals (19). As such, district health systems have
135 attracted investments from international development partners. Therefore, an
136 examination of political economy factors at the subnational level, their influence on the
137 effectiveness of investments in sub-national systems is timely.

138 This article is based on a three-district case study about the political economy of
139 subnational HSS in Uganda. The study sought to understand why health systems at
140 the subnational level are failing to improve despite marked investments. More
141 specifically, our study set out to explore a) how do the financing and planning
142 ecosystems function to support HSS at subnational level and the related challenges.
143 In addition, b) what are the plausible solutions to address these HSS plans and
144 priorities at subnational level?

145

146 **Materials and Methods**

147 The data used in this paper are drawn from a larger study of the UNICEF-supported
148 District Health Systems Strengthening Initiative (DHSSi) in Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania,
149 and Uganda(20). The goal of DHSSi was to improve sub-national health management
150 and governance as a critical component of HSS necessary to achieve UHC. DHSSi
151 activities were focused on capacity building for evidence use in district planning,
152 implementation, and performance management for district health management teams
153 as well as supporting the scale-up and professionalization of health management(20).
154 During implementation DHSSi identified several management gaps and challenges in
155 the enabling environment that make good management practice difficult(21), and
156 required a better understanding of the political economy at play at subnational level.
157 In 2019, UNICEF requested a political economy analysis of DHSSi in Kenya, Malawi,
158 and Uganda to explore these issues. The study was conducted through a collaboration
159 between Makerere University School of Public Health and Johns Hopkins University.
160 Findings from the sister studies in Kenya and Malawi, as well as a cross-country
161 synthesis of the political economy analysis findings, are available elsewhere (22-24).

162

163 In Uganda, the study team implemented a multiple case study design that employed
164 predominantly qualitative data collection methods, complemented with some
165 secondary data extraction for financial information(21). Three districts were
166 purposively selected in collaboration with UNICEF-Uganda office out of the ten total
167 districts in which the DHSSi project was implemented from 2019- 2022(25). The study
168 districts were Iganga, Kiryandongo, and Isingiro(21). Table 1 summarizes the district
169 characteristics and case selection criteria. Convenience and proximity to Kampala was
170 also considered to facilitate data collection.

171 **Table 1: Summary of district characteristics and case selection criteria**

Characteristics	Districts		
	Kiryandongo	Iganga	Isingiro
Geographical location	West	East	West
Year of establishment	2010	1975*	1991
Total population	266,197	504,197	486,360
Health systems Performance (per UNICEF baseline) %	73.5	74.9	69.1
Position on National League table 2019 out of 135 districts	22	57	97

172 Note: *name changed in 1980 (26-28)

173

174

175 Data collection

176 Data collection methods included key informant interviews (KIIs), document review,
 177 and two stakeholder dissemination and validation meetings. Using unstructured
 178 thematic guide derived from the problem-driven PEA conceptual framework, the
 179 research team conducted Forty-nine KIIs between November 2020 and April 2021 with
 180 purposively selected respondents. Respondents included representatives of local and
 181 central government ministries, funding agencies, and implementing partners (see
 182 Table 2).

183 **Table 2: Summary of the categories of participants and number of interviews**
 184 **across districts.**

	KIIs	Participant categories
District 1	14	District Health Officers, District planners, Biostatisticians, Chief Administrative Officers, Local Council (LC5) Chairpersons, Village Health Team members, Health Unit Management committees, Health Inspectors, Health Sub-district In-charges
District 2	14	
District 3	13	

Central Government	3	Ministry of Health
Implementing partners	5	
Total number of interviews	49	
Gender		
Female	9	
Male	40	

185

186 The research team organised two virtual stakeholder dissemination and validation
187 meetings. Participants included stakeholders of the health sector budget- working
188 group, including MOH officials and other development partners, as well as selected
189 district leaders. All interviews were conducted in English. District-level respondents
190 participated in interviews in person. Either national level respondents participated in
191 person or remotely, as was feasible during the data collection period, which coincided
192 with several COVID-19 pandemic related meeting and movement restrictions. Where
193 respondents provided their permission, the study team recorded the KIIs.

194

195 For the document review, over forty documents on HSS, guidelines for policy and
196 planning, as well as fiscal management were pragmatically identified and reviewed.
197 The type of documents reviewed included grey literature and reports on the
198 implementation and evaluation of programs, government reports and policies, and
199 some peer-reviewed articles. Financial data were obtained from the district
200 administrations, on request.

201

202 **Data analysis**

203 Emerging themes from the document review were integrated into the findings of the
204 KIIs and so were findings from the data extraction. KII audio recordings were
205 transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were reviewed by the team and analysis was
206 conducted manually, guided by the framework used in the study design. The PEA

207 analytical framework by Siddiqi et al 2009 (29), was used to identify the parameters
208 that are by nature political but not necessarily explicit in the data but rather expressed
209 through idioms, metaphors, and other expressions. Therefore, latent content analysis
210 was a key consideration in the analytical approach. The PEA framework focuses on a
211 specific problem or policy to better understand a challenging issue and the institutional
212 dynamics contributing to the problem, including the broader actors and systems
213 factors that facilitate or hinder change (30-32). Details about stages of analysis and
214 collaborations among teams across domains have been elaborated in recently
215 published papers emerging from this work(24).

216

217 **Ethics approval**

218 The study received an exemption and approval from the Johns Hopkins School of
219 Public Health (JHSPH) ethics board (IRB.no. 12934). The protocol was submitted and
220 cleared by the Higher Degrees, Research and Ethics Committee (HDREC) of
221 Makerere University School of Public Health (Protocol No. 890), and Uganda National
222 Council for Science and Technology (UNCST) for approval (SS664ES).

223 **Ethical statement**

224 Formal written consent was obtained from all study participants at both national and
225 subnational level. Given the political nature of the study, participants were assured of
226 anonymity. The study team also decided to give codes according to category of
227 organization level that was being represented by a particular participant. For instance,
228 terms such as “district respondent” and “IP respondent” were used. Within the text for
229 findings, the districts were blindly given numbers 1, 2, 3, for anonymity purposes.
230 The district name to which the number was assigned, is only known to the study team.

231 All data was stored on a password protected computer, accessed only by the research
232 team members.

233 Furthermore, Additionally, the study was conducted in the context of the COVID- 19
234 pandemic. As a result, there were other extra standard operational procedures
235 provided by the Ministry of Health such as social distancing, use of masks, and hand
236 washing/sanitization, which were also strictly observed by the study team. While the
237 study team had planned a mix of virtual and in-person interviews, respondents at the
238 district level preferred the latter.

239 **RESULTS**

240 We structure our findings around two broad themes, which interact to curtail progress
241 on HSS at subnational level: financing and the planning process. Under each of these
242 themes, we highlight the main sub-themes that emerged from our political economy
243 analysis.

244

245 **Financing**

246 The sticky issues around financing related to insufficient amount of funds disbursed,
247 delays in disbursement, Insufficient locally generated revenue, resource allocation
248 priorities, mismatch between resources and targets, and duplicative bureaucracies for
249 implementation and related perceptions among actors.

250 *Insufficient resources at the sub-national level*

251 Our analysis confirmed grossly insufficient resources allocated from the Central
252 government to LGs, relative to the population size and expected obligations in
253 healthcare service delivery. Several KII respondents suggested inadequate financial
254 and non-financial resources at the subnational level as the most pervasive problem to

255 all HSS efforts. Findings from the document review indicated that the primary reason
256 for constantly low resource allocation from the centre was insufficient national
257 revenues to the health sector as well as inflation (33). Indeed, a financial analysis (Fig
258 1) of available data on government allocations illustrated a negligible increase
259 overtime in funding to our study districts for fiscal years 2018/19, 2019/2020 and
260 2020/2021.

261

262 **Figure 1: Total government funding by fiscal year (2018-2021) in US Dollars**

263 **Source:** Financial data extracted from study districts.

264

265 Despite the contextual differences across districts in terms of population size, location,
266 year established, and other demographic factors, the difference in the funds allocated
267 across the board was negligible. Moreover, the main source of funding from the centre
268 is the Conditional Primary Health Care (PHC) allocations, which are disbursed on a
269 quarterly basis. PHC funding covers several activities linked to centrally determined
270 annual priorities, and is accompanied with guidelines and budget items, hence
271 providing limited flexibility for reallocation at the district level.

272

273 Although the available data across all three districts points to stable resource
274 allocations, most of our respondents reported a perceived reduction in financial
275 allocations from the central government. Findings of the document review indicated
276 the “reduction” over time was due to monetary loss of value resulting from (1) inflation,
277 and (2) the rapid proliferation of districts and administrative units.

278

279 Further complicating resource availability, insufficient financial resources from the
280 central government created high dependence on funding streams that have pre-
281 determined priorities, such as donor funding whose priorities are determined at the
282 global or national level, without consideration of specific subnational problems,
283 priorities, and needs. According to the respondents' reflections, the funding conditions
284 directly affected planning and the local decision space and often at the expense of
285 local priorities.

286

287 *Delays in disbursement*

288 Across all districts, respondents reported significant delays in receiving available
289 resources, meager as they are, further delaying the implementation of district work
290 plans. While there were reports of improvements in the timeliness of disbursements in
291 district 2, coping strategies innovated by subnational managers from districts 1 and 2
292 were needed to ensure implementation of health activities. These included asking
293 health workers to "loan their time," district offices taking loans/debt for the needed
294 services and commodities from local service providers including petrol stations and
295 stationary shops. In both cases, subnational managers deferred payments, however,
296 in extreme situations, they mentioned that they were forced to delay or cancel the
297 implementation of some of the activities. Respondents from district 3 never mentioned
298 any self-innovated coping strategies, rather they leveraged on support from
299 implementing partners.

300

301 *"And yet getting the money is not quick [...] we go ahead and do the activity on*
302 *debt. [...] We do the accountability and pay later. So [...] requesting the people*
303 *[health workers] to do the activity [...] as we are processing [...] we go to fuel*

304 *stations and borrow the fuel then we tell the people to do the work. As for*
 305 *stationery, there are contracted suppliers. We issue them with Local Purchase*
 306 *Orders [LPOs] and they give us the stationery.” (District respondent_07)*

307

308 The financial data needed for the analysis of available budgets for specific health
 309 service delivery and technical areas was unavailable and with many missing data
 310 points. Across all three districts, there were gaps in financial data, although district 3
 311 was worse off as it lacked data for two fiscal years. In relation to financial data from
 312 donors compared to funds from government for specific service delivery areas, there
 313 were data gaps as well. The amount of donor funding was greater than government
 314 funding for most of the technical areas where data existed (table 3).

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323 *Table 3: Comparative analysis of government vs donor funding by technical areas*

Technical area	FY 2018/19 (USD)				FY 2019/20 (USD)			
	District 1		District 2		District 1		District 2	
	GOU	Donors	GOU	Donors	GOU	Donors	GOU	Donors
1. Technical support supervision-DHT team	1,444	2,222	9,611	DNA	333	DNA	11,791	DNA

2.Support supervision - Integrated (Political DHT) +	DNA	DNA	7,922	DNA	1,111	DNA	10,005	DNA
3.Immunization activities	18,056	66,667	6,111	DNA	DNA	166,667	6,111	DNA
4.Maternal newborn and child health activities	889	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	222,222	DNA	DNA
5.Nutritional activities	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
6.TB activities	444	1,812	DNA	DNA	1,700	DNA	DNA	DNA
7.HIV activities	4,444	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	27,778	DNA	DNA
8.HMIS (Data supervision)	667	473	833	DNA	1,667	DNA	1,000	DNA

324

325 Note: Dollar equivalent at rate of 3600/= . DNA= Data not available, Source: financial
326 data extraction and analysis by study team.
327

328 Further analysis of available data from district 1 and 2 showed more consistency of
329 availability of funds for some specific programs such as immunization and maternal
330 and child health, compared to other areas.

331

332 *Insufficient and 'inequitable' Local revenue*

333 The Local Government Act 1997 enables local governments to collect taxes as a
334 reliable source of funding (16). The local revenue generated would ideally provide a
335 fallback option when delays occur with central funding. Besides, the local revenue is
336 earmarked to fund areas such as salaries for the staff not on government pay rolls.
337 However, in addition to local tax revenues being limited, politics at the district level
338 rendered it difficult for the health department to access such funds. For example, in
339 one of the districts by politicians at local government level perceived the District Health
340 Office to be "richer than other departments" because it had many externally funded

341 implementing partners supporting activities. Therefore, monies were either siphoned
342 by those in charge or “preserved for worse off departments,” hence hindering
343 implementation of some operational activities for health.

344

345 *“[...] we are not able to give a good helping hand into the health sector, given*
346 *the availability of some donors in the department than any other department.*
347 *So, having extraordinarily little PHC has again caused issues at the facilities*
348 *because you may find a very bushy compound, facilities don’t have fencing [...]*
349 *(District Respondent_05)*

350

351 *[...] As health [department] we have taken long without benefiting from it [Local*
352 *revenue] so, it is as if it is not there. (District Respondent_17)*

353

354 *Resource allocation priorities*

355 The study found that fund holders’ priorities were biased towards greater investments
356 in “software,” aimed at improving information technology (IT), trainings, and behavioral
357 change communication, data for planning, report cards and community engagements
358 for accountability. In contrast, subnational respondents reported several major
359 “hardware” investment priorities that are needed to strengthen subnational health
360 systems, such as infrastructure, health workforce strengthening, building maternity
361 homes, providing more nurses and doctors, building accommodation for health
362 workers, and increasing the stocks for medicines. Most hardware priorities were
363 focused on infrastructural development, which, except in very few instances, tended
364 to be ignored by both the central government and implementing partners (IPs). In a
365 few instances, there was a mention of implementing partners focusing more on

366 renovations and refurbishments. Nevertheless, as stated by some respondents, such
367 hardware investment needs perpetually remain on the list of “unfunded” priorities and
368 the system remains fragile.

369

370 *"[...] but these [infrastructural developments] remain unfunded because there*
371 *is always no money and Partners do not want to fund such things...they [IPs]*
372 *reached an understanding amongst themselves that they do not want to go*
373 *through capital development."* (District Respondent_ 07)

374

375 *Mismatch between resources and service delivery targets or* 376 *expectations*

377 The mismatch between the service delivery targets and resources also emerged as a
378 key issue. The respondents attributed blamed this on the inadequacy of resources,
379 coupled with overwhelming local community needs and expectations, unrealistic
380 demands from central government, and the general dilemma of cost-efficiency (i.e.,
381 desire to do so much using minimal resources). The study found that many frustrations
382 about HSS interventions at subnational level arise from having too grand expectations
383 from IPs and central government despite little resources made available to LGs. As
384 reflected by district respondents' experiences in the case of the Measles Rubella
385 Campaign of 2020, expectations of targets were misaligned with operational costs and
386 realities on the ground. Unfortunately, despite the discomfort, the LGs had no choice,
387 but to accept whatever is received and work within the limited resources. The nature
388 of hierarchy between local government and the central government provides no room
389 for the former to negotiate.

390

391 *“For measles rubella, the Ministry of Health [...] thought for us [...] and they*
392 *said that district Y, we are giving you this much and you are going to implement*
393 *it this way. Of course, we wanted to tell them that it might not work. Let me give*
394 *you an example. They calculated that we have 200 and something schools, but*
395 *here the [District Education Officer] DEO had 938 schools [in the records]. Now,*
396 *[...] on the ground, we also found day care centres, which were operating*
397 *without DEO’s knowledge. So, we had to work within the available budget to*
398 *meet all this demand. We had to arm-twist [staff] [...]” (District Respondent_04).*

399

400 Furthermore, in relation to planning for human resources for health, one of the district
401 managers acknowledged the mismatch of needs and targets as an apparent problem
402 that hindered plans for recruitment and filling of staffing gaps, with district managers
403 resorting to identifying ways of uncomfortably managing with in the minimum or leaving
404 the status quo.

405

406 *“[...] you cannot implement something for which you know there is no money.*
407 *For example, if you have 400 health workers and they are taking 4 billion*
408 *and[yet] you need 700 health workers[who] they will take 10 billion you cannot*
409 *just say I want 700 health workers at least you keep on increasing, because the*
410 *resource envelope is small. So [...] we have not gotten funding for all the needs*
411 *because the needs are far more than the resources.” (District Respondent_17)*

412

413 *Duplicative bureaucracies for implementation and related perceptions*

414 The study found that many donors channel resources to districts by sub-contracting
415 IPs to implement some of the programs at sub-national level instead of utilizing

416 existing district structures. This created a missed opportunity for supporting district
417 capacity strengthening directly and for increasing the financial resources available
418 locally to district leaders for implementing their work plans.

419

420 *“[...] if UNICEF is doing work in one place, Baylor is doing work [on behalf of*
421 *UNICEF]. It [UNICEF] does not work there itself. [...] They do not give you cash*
422 *[...]” (District Respondent _13)*

423

424 At the same time, local government respondents reported frustrations and perceived
425 increases in workload related to the separate bureaucracies and coordination
426 introduced by implementing partner projects. Some respondents also suggested
427 feelings of mistrust, which contributed to strained relationships between subnational
428 level actors and IPs. For example, multiple IPs working at the sub-national level were
429 reported to have introduced an extra layer of data, requisition and reporting structures,
430 tools and guidelines for reporting and accountability on top of those from central
431 government. Accordingly, respondents also noted challenges harmonizing the
432 approaches, rules, and guidelines among diverse actors in the district, which created
433 reporting burden on subnational governments within tight timelines. Furthermore, the
434 general perception among district respondents was that IPs were not as transparent
435 as expected, specifically about available budgets, which complicated planning for
436 service delivery at subnational level.

437

438 *“[...] they [IPs] do not want us to see their budget.” District Respondent _15)*

439

440 *“[...] Most of them [IPs] do not disclose. They will say we are going to do this,*
441 *but you may not know about the budget, how much [money] they must spend.”*
442 *(District Respondent _33)*

443
444 When probed about the issue, IP respondents indicated that creating separate
445 bureaucracies arose due to increasing concerns about local corruption, delays in
446 accountability, and a greater emphasis on increasing value for money from donor
447 agencies. These influenced IP practices such as not extending direct transfer of funds
448 to districts or electronically wiring payments directly to beneficiaries or participants.

449
450 *“We [IPs] do not give money directly to the districts [...] when the activity is*
451 *approved, we tell them [district team] to [go] ahead and start implementation.*
452 *[...] For example, for a meeting, we pay attendees via mobile [phone] money*
453 *[...] (District respondent_10)*

454
455 *“But our[donor/IP] funding does not allow that [direct cash transfer to district*
456 *accounts]. While we do budget support, it is in kind. We will not put money on*
457 *the district account [...] if it [is] the health worker who has done the activity, we*
458 *send the money directly to that health worker [...] (IP Respondent_19)*

459

460 *Plausible solutions in relation to financing challenges*

461 In response to the finance related challenges, the respondents also identified broad
462 recommendations about what central government and donors should to address some
463 of the challenges. These recommendations were checked and validated during the
464 dissemination workshops and are summarised in table 4

465

466 **Table 4: Plausible solutions in relation to financing challenges**

1. The central government should expand LGs’ decision space to allow them to allocate resources according to local community priorities, in line with a decentralized governance system.
2. Donors and central government should empower LGs to negotiate realistic health targets, seeking to realign targets with the resources available and associated operational costs of service delivery.
3. All implementing partners focusing on systems strengthening at sub-national level should prioritize “hardware” investments, e.g., infrastructure, health workforce strengthening. “Software” investments, e.g., Data for planning, IT, community engagement for accountability will gain more traction after hardware gaps have been addressed.
4. Donors should directly finance health systems directly rather than engaging third-party organizations, such as IPs, which may absorb extensive financial and operational costs for HSS activities, resources that could be directly invested into district systems. In the short term, Governments and donors should consider pooling of funds to reduce waste as well as eliminating third parties’ costs.

467 During the validation meetings, the district respondents confirmed the findings while
 468 both the central government and IPs responded accordingly and tended to be
 469 defensive justifying what was going on instead of agreeing with the recommendations.

470

471 **The planning processes**

472 In relation to planning and related processes, the key issues emerging from our data
 473 included conflicting interests and motivations among HSS actors at sub-national level,
 474 distorted accountability mechanisms, variations in planning cycles, shortcuts to
 475 community engagement. We expand on each of them and their interactions in the
 476 sections below.

477

478 *Conflicting interests and motivations among actors*

479 The study found a proliferation of actors within the subnational level planning space,
 480 with varying interests and power, crowding the decision space. These actors are

481 located at both the district and national levels. At subnational level, actors include
482 district level managers, technical teams, extended district management teams,
483 administrators, political leaders, implementing partners, and the community
484 representatives. Engagement of many actors in the local planning processes
485 increases transactional costs and creates a congested space for decision-making. In
486 addition, the influence of politicians at the subnational level during the planning
487 process led to diversion of discussions and has a potential effect on outcomes for
488 prioritization.

489

490 Despite the oversight role planned by central government agencies and the
491 coordination role attempted by subnational managers, the influence of IPs at the
492 subnational level cannot be underestimated. For instance, two of the study districts
493 report receiving support for Refugees from IPs. Although the government refugee
494 policy emphasizes integration and equal access for all, IPs were reported to
495 exclusively prioritize refugee populations' access to health services. This was
496 interpreted as unfair treatment for the host communities, hence resulting in some
497 conflict among refugees and host communities.

498

499 *Distorted accountability mechanisms*

500 The study identified dual track systems for accountability created by multiplicity of
501 guidelines that undermine the subnational government decision space leading to
502 distortions in the financing and accounting systems and a lack of mutual accountability
503 within the health system. Even within the internal systems of the subnational
504 governments, there were unequal relations in the distribution of resources due to
505 power relations. For instance, the local priorities as defined by the district health

506 management teams (DHMTs) were ignored by implementing partners in favor of
507 priorities of the most powerful (fund holders).

508

509 Subnational level governments in general experienced challenges related to existence
510 of many accountability rules from the central government and donors. District
511 representatives reported penalties for returning unspent monies, as well as
512 punishment for unmet service delivery needs relative targets set at the centre. For
513 example, some did not receive additional funds until reporting obligations were made.
514 This created a vicious cycle of deficient performance and inequalities among districts.
515 Fewer innovations and rules were found to address the accountability to LGs from
516 fund holders, however, and LGs were expected to adapt health plans in a context of
517 frequent disbursement delays and shifting budgets.

518

519 *“[...] actually, there is no financial year that moves in an appropriate and timely*
520 *manner [...] that has not happened; all the phases are delayed.” (District*
521 *Respondent _12)*

522

523 *“At the end of the fiscal year, you will be told budget cuts. So sometimes, some*
524 *budget activities are not implemented. You find sometimes you started an*
525 *activity, and you have already put-on funds then it comes short. That will mean*
526 *you have to push it to the next fiscal year. Those have been common issues*
527 *because of the budget cuts and the failure to raise adequate revenue by sub-*
528 *national/ government to meet at least these gaps” District Respondent_33*

529

530 Consequently, we found that the subnational level actors generally had limited
531 decision space around implementing the district, facility, and community priorities. This
532 was because of dependence on the centre for conditional grants coupled with pre-
533 determined priorities with limited room for flexibility. The existence of many rules
534 related to the planning process impeded it. For example, some respondents were
535 concerned that the over-layering of rules created thick bureaucracies, unnecessary
536 red tapes, and rigidity, which paralyzed decision making and ultimately affected
537 planning and implementation at the local level.

538

539 *“[...] Governments are a strait jacket. If you try to do creative, thinking that you*
540 *are doing a noble cause, you will ‘burn your fingers’”. (District Respondent _11)*

541

542 *Variations in planning cycles*

543 Furthermore, respondents reported variations in planning cycles and priorities for IPs
544 and districts, which created distortions and made harmonization with district priorities
545 difficult. However, the district respondents noted that they continuously tolerated the
546 situation for fear of “losing” their support to other districts.

547

548 *“[...] the challenge we have with IPs is...their budget cycle is not the same as*
549 *ours and some of them run a Calendar year, yet we run a financial year [...]*
550 *(District respondent _ 15)*

551

552 *“[...] Even before we have our budget approval for the next year [...] often,*
553 *the district is already finalizing their budget and since we have not yet finalized*
554 *our budget, we cannot commit funds to the district before the donor approves.*

555 *The district cycle starts in October [...] our cycle starts in July. Sometimes you*
556 *find that there is a certain lag in between” (IP respondent_19)*

557 *Shortcuts to community engagement*

558 Community participation in planning and accountability is subjective to many different
559 definitions, scope, and purposes. This ranges from community as represented by
560 elected leaders at the district and municipalities, members of the health unit
561 management committee, or village level residents. The rules for community
562 participation assume that the needs of the community will shape the financial priorities
563 at subnational level. We found that the definition and operationalisation of community
564 participation in planning varied in study districts, many shortcuts to community
565 participation. These included using routine health data to inform district plans, using
566 data from previous plans, or pseudo representation of the community. As a result, the
567 communities lost trust in the planning processes due to unmet expectations.

568

569 *[...] you cannot start to say you can consult the whole country over certain*
570 *things, you will fail; but when you look at the proxy indicators, they can help you*
571 *to understand the community. (District Respondent _13)*

572

573 *[...]Sometimes we sit and think that these health facility management*
574 *committees are [very] powerful in making things work but not much. [...] they*
575 *cannot go beyond recommending. Moreover, their ‘recommendations’ are*
576 *crafted by the medical officer or the in charge or whoever and it may not be*
577 *really biting. (District Respondent _11)*

578

579 *Plausible solutions for Planning process challenges*

580

581 *Table 5: solutions for Planning process challenges*

1. Donors and central government need to incentivize practices that support health systems strengthening at sub-national level, e.g., improving disbursement delays.
2. Central governments need to increase discretionary funding for PHC to enable action on local health priorities
3. Stakeholders (central government, donors, IPs, and subnational level) should strengthen mutual accountability between donors and subnational level actors and between central and local government, to address the discrepancy of accountability burden, and to incentivize practices which support district HSS, e.g., improving disbursement delays.
4. Central government needs to simplify the rules and procedures for the planning process to enable implementation in a phased manner. First, HSS stakeholders (government, donors, and IPs and subnational level actors) should revisit and agree upon a minimum set of rules and guidelines to enable effective planning, management, and accountability. Secondly, stakeholders should agree on a process to improve rational adoption of new rules and innovations, which should be subjected to an Impact Assessment to determine feasibility of implementation and scale-up prior to adoption.
5. Community participation requirements should be relaxed to avoid generating mistrust over nonresponsive budgets. Stakeholders seeking to engage community members in planning processes should be clear and transparent about the definition, scope, and purpose of community participation

582

583

584 **Discussion**

585

586 The performance of subnational/local governments in the health sector has remained
587 sub-optimal despite consensus on the importance of subnational health systems to
588 the delivery of quality, affordable, and equitable health services, as well as despite
589 heavy investments in HSS. The findings from our application of the PEA framework
590 accentuate the fact that to understand a problem, you must reflect on the underlying
591 characteristics of the problem as well as its root causes (Siddiqi et al 2009). In Uganda,

592 we found that the problem of sub-optimal performance of the health system at sub-
593 national level was driven by a constellation of factors that limited subnational decision
594 space and created barriers to implementation. These include several complex
595 dilemmas: inadequate resources as well as underspent budgets, insufficient
596 management capacity at local level as well as duplicative bureaucracies, a
597 proliferation of external actors engaged in Subnational government decision-making,
598 often at the expense of engaging with local communities, and unrealized
599 implementation plans and underutilized data, resulting in health plans and budgets
600 inadequately responsive to community-generated priorities(21).

601

602 These health system challenges reflect, in part, an incomplete decentralization
603 process in Uganda. While district health teams at subnational level have taken on
604 increasing responsibility for health service delivery, fiscal and planning autonomy are
605 yet to be achieved. Subnational governments remain dependent on the central
606 government for funding, which often oversteps their mandate and dictates subnational
607 government plans through conditional grants. In comparison with Malawi(23) and
608 Kenya(22), the situation was unique to Uganda(24). The challenges further reflect the
609 complex dynamics between a country's bureaucracy and external funders. In Uganda,
610 subnational level actors are similarly beholden to donors and IPs that are active in
611 their districts. Subnational actors rely on additional funding streams from external
612 partners to stretch health dollars. This influx of funding gives donors and IPs major
613 influence in defining district-level priorities, however, and often deprioritizes health
614 and creates duplicative reporting streams which place additional administrative burden
615 on DHMTs. Streamlining bureaucratic processes and engagement to focus on shared
616 priorities is critical but is far from being realised.

617

618 Finally, inadequate financing emerged as the main factor hindering DHMTs to
619 advance HSS efforts and meet the ever-growing population needs and demands.

620 The proportion of the national budgetary allocation to health sector continues to fall
621 short of the Abuja declaration recommended target of 15% (34, 35), albeit a slight
622 increment from 7.8% in 2019/20 (36) to 9.8% in FY 2021/22(37). This finding has
623 implications for strategies to empower district governments with revenue as well as
624 increased bargaining power to negotiate with funders to address local priorities.

625

626

627 **Study strengths and study limitations**

628 This study is the first problem-based political economy analysis of its kind and the
629 most recent one conducted in Uganda. Together with its sister studies in Malawi and
630 Kenya, it richly updates the prior literature reflecting on decentralization, as well as on
631 the consequences of this process on the health sector, in Uganda and more broadly
632 in Eastern Africa.

633

634 Nevertheless, this analysis had several limitations. First, it was not possible to obtain
635 all the necessary financial data to conduct a complete financial analysis as well as
636 interpretation. Second, our study did not examine the role of the private not for profit
637 sector, which plays a significant role filling in gaps in public service delivery in Uganda.

638 Third, due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and effects prevented the study team
639 to capture the effects on district planning fully and restricted engagement with national
640 level stakeholders through video-interviews. Repeat interviews were not possible, so
641 there was only limited follow-up to emerging themes. Saturation was not achieved in

642 all themes and sub-themes, and a cross-case comparison among our case districts
643 was not possible.

644 **Conclusion**

645 In conclusion, the Political Economy Analysis lens is a useful approach to
646 understanding why health systems strengthening interventions at subnational level in
647 Uganda have stagnated despite massive investments. The challenges for HSS are
648 embedded in the structural reality as well as agency interests, power-relations, and
649 actions, which are often at the expense of the local governments' means and decision
650 space. An extensive examination of this reality by vote holders and central decision
651 makers and donors will thus help to address the massive challenges highlighted in the
652 analysis. The recommendations provided by respondents remain a wish list, because
653 the district representatives are alienated from the centrally and donor driven priorities
654 and decision making and further constrained by the related bureaucracies. Future
655 research should not overlook the political economy dimensions present within
656 subnational government units and its influence on resource allocation as well as the
657 performance of implementing district work plans with existing resources. Development
658 partners will continue to play a significant role in compensation for financial and
659 technical local shortfalls. However, their support to HSS, donor resources and
660 engagement should not happen at the cost of the subnational voice in priority setting
661 and decision-making. The tension between national and subnational units will remain
662 and will continue to be problematic until subnational units have a bigger say and
663 control over the way the resources are allocated, capacity necessary to lead their
664 programs in a truly decentralized fashion.

665

666

667 **Acknowledgements**

668 The COVID-19 pandemic broke out during our data collection period and increased
669 the pressure and demands on national and local decision makers. Our appreciation
670 goes to all the individuals who agreed to participate in this study at both national and
671 subnational level. Special thanks to district level managers who worked tirelessly to
672 ensure continued health service delivery for local communities. We thank UNICEF-
673 Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office, UNICEF country office in Uganda and
674 Ministry of Health in Uganda for their feedback and support in disseminating findings.

675 We also acknowledge the commitment from the members of the study team at
676 School of Public Health, Makerere University. Without their effort, in the face of the
677 COVID-19 pandemic, this study would not have been possible.

678

679

680 REFERENCES

681

682 1. Chee G, Pielemeier N, Lion A, Connor C. Why differentiating between health system
683 support and health system strengthening is needed. *Int J Health Plann Manage.*

684 2013;28(1):85-94.

685 2. Warren AE, Wyss K, Shakarishvili G, Atun R, de Savigny D. Global health initiative
686 investments and health systems strengthening: a content analysis of global fund

687 investments. *Globalization and health.* 2013;9(1):1-14.

688 3. Kieny MP, Bekedam H, Dovlo D, Fitzgerald J, Habicht J, Harrison G, et al.

689 Strengthening health systems for universal health coverage and sustainable development.

690 *Bulletin of the World Health Organization.* 2017;95(7):537.

691 4. Bump JB. The long road to universal health coverage: historical analysis of early
692 decisions in Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States. *Health Systems &*

693 *Reform.* 2015;1(1):28-38.

694 5. Mansour W, Aryaija-Karemani A, Martineau T, Namakula J, Mubiri P, Ssengooba F, et
695 al. Management of human resources for health in health districts in Uganda: A decision

696 space analysis. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management.*

697 2022;37(2):770-89.

698 6. Ssengooba F, Kawooya V, Namakula J, Fustukian S. Application of social network

699 analysis in the assessment of organization infrastructure for service delivery: a three district
700 case study from post-conflict northern Uganda. *Health Policy and Planning.*

701 2017;32(8):1193-202.

- 702 7. Tarimo E. Towards a healthy district: organizing and managing district health systems
703 based on primary health care: ERIC; 1991.
- 704 8. Tumusiime P, Karamagi H, Titi-Ofei R, Amri M, Seydi ABW, Kipruto H, et al., editors.
705 Building health system resilience in the context of primary health care revitalization for
706 attainment of UHC: proceedings from the Fifth Health Sector Directors' Policy and Planning
707 Meeting for the WHO African Region. BMC proceedings; 2020: BioMed Central.
- 708 9. Witter S, Thomas S, Topp SM, Barasa E, Chopra M, Cobos D, et al. Health system
709 resilience: a critical review and reconceptualisation. The Lancet Global Health.
710 2023;11(9):e1454-e8.
- 711 10. Adam T, De Savigny D. Systems thinking for strengthening health systems in LMICs:
712 need for a paradigm shift. . Health policy and planning. 2012;1(27):iv1-3.
- 713 11. Barasa EW, Cloete K, Gilson L. From bouncing back, to nurturing emergence:
714 reframing the concept of resilience in health systems strengthening. Health policy and
715 planning. 2017;32(suppl_3):iii91-iii4.
- 716 12. Gilson L, Barasa E, Nxumalo N, Cleary S, Goudge J, Molyneux S, et al. Everyday
717 resilience in district health systems: emerging insights from the front lines in Kenya and
718 South Africa. BMJ global health. 2017;2(2):e000224.
- 719 13. Ssenyonjo A, Van Belle S, Ssenkooba F, Titeca K, Bakubi R, Criel B. Not for us,
720 without us: examining horizontal coordination between the Ministry of Health and other
721 sectors to advance health goals in Uganda. Health Policy and Planning. 2022;37(10):1221-
722 35.
- 723 14. Peters BG. Toward policy coordination: alternatives to hierarchy. Rethinking Policy
724 and Politics: Policy Press; 2014. p. 139-58.

- 725 15. Tashobya CK, V. A. Ogora VA, N. S. Kiwanuka NS, Mutebi A, Musila T, Byakika S, et al.
726 Decentralisation in Uganda Health System: What can we learn from past experiences to
727 facilitate achievement of Universal Health Coverage? Chapter 6. . In: F. Ssengooba NK,
728 Suzanne., E. Rutebemberwa and E. Ekirapa- Kiracho. Kampala, Uganda, Makerere University
729 School of Public Health: , editor. Universal Health Civerage in Uganda Looking back and
730 forward to speed up progres. Kampala, Uganda2018. p. 117-49.
- 731 16. MOLG. Local Government Act. In: MOLG) MoLG, editor. Kampala, Uganda:
732 Government of Uganda; 1997.
- 733 17. Nanyonjo A, Kertho E, Tibenderana J, Källander K. District health teams' readiness to
734 institutionalize integrated community case management in the Uganda local health systems:
735 a repeated qualitative study. Global Health: Science and Practice. 2020;8(2):190-204.
- 736 18. Henriksson DK, Peterson SS, Waiswa P, Frediksson M. Decision-making in district
737 health planning in Uganda: does use of district-specific evidence matter? Health Res Policy
738 Sys 2019;17.
- 739 19. WHO. 'Responding to community spread of COVID-19', Interim Guidance March
740 2020. Available at: www.who.int accessed 2nd September 2021). World Health
741 Organisation; 2020.
- 742 20. United Nations Children's Education Fund. The UNICEF Health Systems
743 Strengthening Approach. UNICEF; 2016.
- 744 21. Ssengooba F, Namakula J, Nsabagasani X, Paina L, Neel AH. Political economy
745 analysis of health management in Eastern and Southern Africa: Uganda country report.:
746 Makerere University School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public
747 Health.; 2021.

- 748 22. Tsofa B, Waweru E, Munywoki J, Soe K, Rodriguez DC, Koon AD. Political economy
749 analysis of sub-national health sector planning and budgeting: A case study of three
750 counties in Kenya. PLoS Global Public Health. 2023;3(1):e0001401.
- 751 23. Munthali AC, Kalumba J, Mkombe D ea. Political Economy Analysis of Sub-national
752 Health Management in Eastern and Southern Africa: Malawi Country Report. Malawi; 2021.
- 753 24. Rodríguez DC, Balaji LN, Chamdimba E, Kafumba J, Koon AD, Mazalale J, et al.
754 Political economy analysis of subnational health management in Kenya, Malawi and
755 Uganda. Health Policy and Planning. 2023;38(5):631-47.
- 756 25. Evaluation of UNICEF's District Health Systems Strengthening Initiative 2019-2022
757 [Internet]. UNICEF, East and Southern Country Office, Kenya. 2022. Available from:
758 [https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/reports#/detail/16233/evaluation-of-unicefs-district-](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/reports#/detail/16233/evaluation-of-unicefs-district-health-systems-strengthening-initiative-2019-2022)
759 [health-systems-strengthening-initiative-2019-2022](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/reports#/detail/16233/evaluation-of-unicefs-district-health-systems-strengthening-initiative-2019-2022).
- 760 26. Muhumuza S. Baseline Assessment of district health systems capacity: Use of DHSS
761 progression model- Final Report
762 Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala; 2020.
- 763 27. MOH. Annual Health Sector Performance Report 2019/20. In: Health Mo, editor.
764 Kampala, Uganda2019.
- 765 28. Ssengooba F, Namakula J, Nsabagasani X, Paina L, Neel A. Political Economy Analysis
766 of Sub-National Health Management in Eastern and Southern Africa. Uganda Country
767 Report. Kampala and Baltimore: Makerere University School of Public Health and Johns
768 Hopkins School of Public Health; 2021.
- 769 29. Siddiqi S, Masud TI, Nishtar S, Peters DH, Sabri B, Bile KM, et al. Framework for
770 assessing governance of the health system in developing countries: gateway to good
771 governance. Health Policy. 2009;90(1):13-25.

772 30. Fritz VB. Problem-Driven Political Economy Analysis: The World Bank’s Experience.
773 Washington, DC.: The World Bank; 2014.

774 31. Harris D. Applied political economy analysis: A problem-driven framework. Overseas
775 Development Institute – Methods and Resource. Overseas Development Institute; 2013.

776 32. UK-DFID. Political Economy Analysis How To Note - A DFID practice paper. UK-DFID;
777 2009.

778 33. Okwero P, Tandon A, Mclaughlin J, Hoogeveen J. Fiscal Space for Health in Uganda.
779 Washington, DC.: WorldBank; 2010.

780 34. Okwero P, Tandon A, Mclaughlin J, Hoogeveen J. Fiscal Space for Health in Uganda.
781 WORLD BANK WORKING PAPER NO. 186.African Human Development Series. Washington,
782 DC: WorldBank; 2010.

783 35. MOH, Health Syetems 20/20, Makerere University School of Public Health. Uganda
784 Health System Assessment 2011, Ministry of Health Uganda(MOH), United States Agency for
785 International development (USAID). Kampala, Uganda and Bethesda, MD:: Ministry of
786 Health, Makerere University School of Public Health. Health Systems 20/20 project; 2012.

787 36. MOH. Sector Grant and Budget Guidelines to Health Facilities for FY 2020/21.
788 Primary Health Care Non-Wage Recurrent Grant and Budget Guidelines to Health Centre II,
789 III and IV, and General Hospitals. . In: Health Mo, editor. Kampala, Uganda.: Government of
790 Uganda 2020.

791 37. PWC. The road to recovery: Building economic resilience. Navigating through
792 Uncertainty: National Budget 2020/21. Kampala, Uganda: PriceWaterHouseCoopers(PWC).
793 2021.

794

Total Government funding by FY 2018- 2021 in US Dollars




Fig 1 Total government funding