

1 **Full title: The policy formulation process, and the role of actors in the policy formulation and**  
2 **implementation process: A policy analysis of the Kenyan free maternity policy**

3

4 **Short title: Policy formulation, and the role of actors in the formulation and implementation**  
5 **process**

6

7 **Authors:**

8 **Boniface Oyugi<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Zilper Audi-Poquillon<sup>3</sup>, Sally Kendall<sup>2</sup>, Stephen Peckham<sup>2</sup>, Edwine Barasa<sup>4,5</sup>**

9

10 1. M and E Advisory Group, P.O. Box 6523 - 00200, Western Heights, The Mint Nairobi, Kenya.

11 2. Centre for Health Services Studies (CHSS), University of Kent, George Allen Wing,  
12 Canterbury CT2 7NF

13 3. Department of Health Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, London,  
14 Cowdray House, Houghton St, WC2A 2AE, UK

15 4. Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme Nairobi,  
16 Nairobi, Kenya

17 5. Center for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University  
18 of Oxford, Oxford, Oxfordshire, UK

19

20 **\*Corresponding Author: Zilper Audi-Poquillon – [z.a.audi-poquillon@lse.ac.uk](mailto:z.a.audi-poquillon@lse.ac.uk)**

21

22 **Email addresses:**

23 **BO:** [boyugi@uonbi.ac.ke](mailto:boyugi@uonbi.ac.ke)

24 **ZAP:** [z.a.audi-poquillon@lse.ac.uk](mailto:z.a.audi-poquillon@lse.ac.uk)

25 **SK:** [S.Kendall-608@kent.ac.uk](mailto:S.Kendall-608@kent.ac.uk)

26 **SP:** [S.Peckham@kent.ac.uk](mailto:S.Peckham@kent.ac.uk)

27 **EB:** [EBarasa@kemri-wellcome.org](mailto:EBarasa@kemri-wellcome.org)

28

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

29 **ORCID IDs**

30 Boniface Oyugi: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9550-9138>

31 Zilper Audi-Poquillon: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6901-7348>

32 Sally Kendall: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2507-0350>

33 Stephen Peckham: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7002-2614>

34 Edwine Barasa: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5793-7177>

35

## 36 **Abstract**

37 Kenya is one of the many African countries committed to advancing its health system reforms  
38 by providing affordable and equitable access to essential health services. In 2016, the Government of  
39 Kenya unveiled an expanded free maternity care policy called '*Linda Mama*' to provide essential health  
40 services for pregnant women. We explored the agenda setting and the formulation of this policy to  
41 understand the processes, content and context, and the role of the actors in the formulation and  
42 implementation. We conducted an exploratory qualitative study, which involved document review, key  
43 informant interviews (KIIs) with national stakeholders, and in-depth interviews with County officials  
44 and health care workers (HCWS). We used a theoretical framework capturing the preliminary situation  
45 analysis of the policy, the processes, the content, and the stakeholders' roles in the formulation and  
46 implementation. This study was conducted in three facilities (levels 3, 4, and 5) in Kiambu County in  
47 Kenya. Data were audio-recorded, transcribed and analysed using a framework thematic approach. We  
48 found that the priorities of the policy were mainly to meet a political campaign agenda but also align  
49 them with the objectives of the country's legal and policy-guiding instruments and the global goals of  
50 SDGs that sought to improve the quality of maternal and neonatal care and eliminate financial barriers.  
51 The policy also sought to enhance access to skilled birth attendance (SBA), and its redesign filled the  
52 challenge of the previous policy. The stakeholders (bureaucrats, professional bodies, public and  
53 developmental partners) influenced the processes of the formulation and the content of the policy  
54 through their power to put forward and advocate for specific ideas through issues framed in a political  
55 and socioeconomic context. Several stakeholders played different roles in the formulation and  
56 implementation based on their interests, power and position in the ecosystem of the policy. Policy  
57 formulation or change requires the agents to work within the relevant context, stakeholder interests,  
58 power, ideas and framing of issues.

59

60 **Keywords:** Kenya; Maternal health; Free maternity policy; Policy actors; Policy agenda;  
61 Policy processes; Policy content

62

## 63 Introduction

64 Kenya is one of the many African countries committed to advancing its health system reforms  
65 by providing affordable and equitable access to essential health services [1]. For instance, user fees  
66 were introduced in public health facilities in the 1980s, and those for outpatient care were suspended in  
67 1990 because of equity concerns but later reintroduced in 1991 [2]. Free maternal deliveries were  
68 introduced in all public healthcare facilities in 2007, but its formulation and implementation was not  
69 well documented [2]. In 2013, following a presidential policy directive, Free Maternity Services (FMS)  
70 was introduced in all public health facilities [3, 4]. The National Government financed the FMS policy  
71 with the funds paid directly to healthcare facilities at Ksh2500 (approximately 27 USDs as of the  
72 implementation time) for every delivery in primary healthcare facilities, whereas the sub-county  
73 hospitals were reimbursed KSh5000 (approximately 55 USDs) for every delivery, normal or caesarean  
74 [1]. However, it faced implementation challenges, specifically with regards to poor service delivery,  
75 due inadequate preparation before its rollout [5]. Thus, in October 2016, the National Government  
76 unveiled an expanded free maternity policy called 'Linda Mama' [Swahili word for - take care of the  
77 mother], managed by the National Hospital Insurance Fund (NHIF) to address the challenges from the  
78 previous policy [6, 7]. It provided a package of essential health services for pregnant women accessed  
79 by all in the targeted population based on need and not the ability to pay [7]. Linda Mama aimed to  
80 achieve universal access to maternal and child health services and contribute to the country's progress  
81 towards Universal Health Coverage (UHC).

82 Since its implementation, several studies have reviewed the Linda Mama programme, but have  
83 only focused on the implementation, its effects and impacts, quality of care and the cost [2, 6, 8-13]. To  
84 our knowledge, no study so far, has documented this policy formulation process, and there remains a  
85 dearth of knowledge in this area. Yet, researchers have shown how problems with policy execution  
86 could be enhanced by having a joint consideration of policy design (sometimes defined as the crafting  
87 of comprehensive causal assumptions, goals and visions, rules, tools, strategies and organisations to  
88 address a particular policy problem) and policy execution. Policymakers create policies that deliver  
89 desired results by carefully aligning the problems, solutions, interests and organisational resources by

90 properly working on the policy design, which postulates plausible scenarios and anticipates future  
91 implementation problems [14]. Further, policy formulation and agenda setting are essential fields of  
92 enquiry which can give insights into the complex formulation process to show how getting and  
93 maintaining policy issues on the agenda is a crucial part of decisions made during policy development  
94 and implementation [15]. Most policy development or formulation (whether as an intent, a written  
95 document, or a practice) does not often follow a particular format as it is a complex and intertwined  
96 process [15, 16]. It is difficult to predict.

97         Researchers have shown why some issues make it onto the policy agenda while others fail. For  
98 example, some have argued that the structure of organisations could explain why some issues are  
99 considered and have an advantage vis-a-vis the alternatives [17]. At the same time, individuals' or even  
100 institutional processes could influence what is to be addressed at any given time. Others have  
101 emphasised the role of external events or public opinions, and how these two combine with political  
102 incentives to shift attention to the policy agenda [17]. Some issues are likely to get a better response  
103 from stakeholders if they have high legitimacy, are highly feasible, and have high support [15, 18].  
104 Besides, the framing of the problem is equally important as it influences how policymakers tackle it.  
105 Noteworthy is the strength of the organisation and individuals concerned with the issue, and how those  
106 involved understand and portray it [19]. Finally, the features of the problem (issue characteristics) and  
107 the political context (the environment in which the actors operate) also play a role [19].

108         Kenya has made some good progress towards reducing neonatal and mortality rates and  
109 improving the coverage of health services in the past decades. For example, the maternal mortality ratio  
110 (MMR) decreased by approximately 6% (from 564 in 2000 to 530 in 2020),[20] while the neonatal  
111 mortality rate reduced from 33 to 21 deaths per 1,000 live births between 1990 and 2022 [21]. However,  
112 despite this progress, many women, neonates and children in the country still experience morbidity and  
113 mortality from preventable pregnancy and child health-related causes [22]. There has also been an  
114 increase in the live births assisted by a skilled provider over the past two decades, from 41% in 2003 to  
115 89% in 2022 [21]. This increase has been attributed to the free maternity policy that the government  
116 introduced in June 2013 [23].

117 This study, therefore, seeks to advance the understanding of Kenya’s free maternity policy  
 118 (FMP) agenda setting and the policy formulation process. It provides some evidence of the issues that  
 119 got into the policy formulation agenda (agenda setting and selection of alternatives), and how they got  
 120 there. It also explores the role of the actors in the free maternity policy process.

121

## 122 **Methods**

### 123 **The guiding conceptual and analytical framework**

124 This policy analysis is based on a conceptual framework derived from literature review and  
 125 health policy analysis frameworks (Table 1) [24]. It captures the background of the policy, derived from  
 126 Hercot et al.’s [25] work, which focuses on the preliminary situation analysis and setting the priorities  
 127 of the policy (an understanding of the origin of the policy). It also emphasises the portrayal of an  
 128 existing window of opportunity needed to restrict the ‘inventory phase’ of a policy [26]. It then draws  
 129 the policy formulation process from Walt and Gilson’s [27] policy triangle of *actors* (whose roles,  
 130 power, and influence during formulation and implementation was analysed through a stakeholder’s  
 131 analysis [28-30]) following into its application in the SHIELD project,[31] *processes* involved during  
 132 formulation, *context* (political, social and economic, local and nationally) of the policy, and *content*  
 133 (envisaged design) of the policy formulation [15].

134 *Table 1: Guiding framework for evaluating the policy process.*

<b>Area of analysis</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Preliminary situation analysis, setting the priorities, and the context of the policy	It captures the highlight of the problem faced, its scope and importance; Postulation of the policy's vision, ownership and leadership (to overcome resistance from different stakeholders); and the clarity on what the policy wants to achieve.  The systemic factors (such as political, social and economic, local and national) that affects policy.	Hercot et al.’s [25] and Buse et al. [15]
Policy formulation processes	How the policy was initiated, (re)formulated or developed, negotiated, communicated, and implemented	Walt and Gilson’s [27] and Buse et al. [15]
Content of the policy	These are the policy's objectives, which refer to the implicit contract between the government and the users (the benefits package of the free maternity package) and the contract	Hercot et al.’s [25]

	between the government and the health facilities (the 'resource contract'), which includes the population and services covered and the funding sources.	
Roles of the stakeholders in the formulation and the implementation	Important players in the policy process whose roles, power, and influence determine the formulation and implementation of a policy.	Buse et al. [15]

135 *Source: Author constructed from literature review*

## 136 **Study Design**

137 This study utilized an exploratory qualitative design which involved document review, key  
 138 informant interviews (KIIs) with national stakeholders, and in-depth interviews with County officials  
 139 and health care workers (HCWS).

## 140 **Study setting**

141 This study was part of a larger study that sought to examine the policy process, quality and cost  
 142 of free maternal healthcare in Kenya [7]. We therefore purposively selected Kiambu County for our  
 143 study, which was conducted between November 2018 and June 2019. Kiambu County was chosen  
 144 because of the logistic feasibility of data collection and the sociodemographic characteristics, health  
 145 indicators and population size [32-34]. It is the second-most populous county in Kenya after Nairobi  
 146 City County, with a population of 2,417,735: 49.1% male and 50.59% female [32] 26.9% of the  
 147 population in Kiambu are female of reproductive age (15-49 Years),[33] and 89.2% of births in the  
 148 county happen in a health facility and 98.2% of births provided by a skilled provider [21].

## 149 **Study population and sampling**

150 We conducted key informant interviews (KIIs) with national level policymakers (n=15); and  
 151 in-depth interviews with sub-national level/County policymakers (n=3); and facility level decision-  
 152 makers (n=18). All these informants were purposively selected based on their knowledge of the FMP,  
 153 and included officials drawn from the Ministry of Health (MoH), the national health insurance agency  
 154 (NHIF); development partners; County department of health officials; facility-in-charge and HCWs and  
 155 others. Documents reviewed included legal documents (n=7), websites (n=5), and other documents  
 156 (n=8) as described in Table 2.

157 *Table 2: Summary of respondents and documents reviewed.*

	Female	Male	Total
<b>County-level and health facility respondents</b>			
The county department of health officials (senior-level and middle-level managers)	2	1	3
Public hospital managers (Medical superintendent, facility-level managers, department in-charges, hospital administrator)	7	2	9
Health Workers (nursing officers, clinical officers, accounting/ clerical officers)	6	3	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>National level respondents</b>			
Ministry of Health officials	4	1	5
NHIF officials	3	0	3
Development partners	2	5	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Documents Reviewed</b>			
Category	Item		
Legal documents	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Constitution of Kenya (Article 187, Article 43)</li> <li>2. The Health Act (Article 2, Article 5, Article 6, Article 7)</li> <li>3. National Hospital Insurance Fund Act</li> <li>4. The County Governments Act, 2012</li> <li>5. Intergovernmental Relations Act, 2012 (section 25)</li> <li>6. Legal Notice 137–183 of August 2013 (which exercise the powers conferred by section 23(1) of the Transition to Devolved Government Act, 2012)</li> <li>7. Legal Notice No.34 National Government Regulation</li> </ol>		
Websites	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Standard Group PLC</li> <li>2. The Nation Media Group</li> <li>3. Kenya Ministry of Health</li> <li>4. The World Health Organisation</li> <li>5. The World Bank</li> </ol>		
Other documents	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Linda Mama implementation manual</li> <li>2. NHIF PowerPoint presentations on Linda Mama (2)</li> <li>3. Draft free maternity service policy</li> <li>4. Rapid assessment of Linda Mama report</li> <li>5. Other Linda Mama case studies reports (2)</li> <li>6. Facilities maternal and child health progress charts and wall hangings/ posters</li> </ol>		

158

## 159 **Data collection and analysis**

160 We conducted in-depth key informant interviews (KIIs) with the national level respondents,  
 161 and in-depth interviews with the implementers (from the county and the facilities), using semi-  
 162 structured interview guides developed to capture the formulation processes and implementation  
 163 experience of the FMP. We first piloted the interview guides in a non-participating facility, to ensure  
 164 the questions captured all the aspects of our research objective. The interviews were conducted in  
 165 English and audio-recorded, each lasting between 30-60 minutes.

166 All the interviews were transcribed verbatim in English and compared against their respective  
 167 audio files by BO for transcription and translation accuracy. All the validated transcripts were imported



168 into NVivo 12. The data were analysed thematically [35-37] following the conceptual framework  
169 described prior. One researcher (BO) assigned unique identifiers to the data, familiarised himself with  
170 the data through immersion and repeatedly read and re-read the transcripts. He then started by  
171 developing ‘lower-order premises evident in the text’ [38] through open coding (assigning codes to  
172 portions of data) [39], thereby creating an initial coding framework. Study team members (SK and SP)  
173 reviewed and discussed the initial coding framework, and any discrepancies were appropriately  
174 reconciled. The final coding framework was applied (by BO) to the data and later charted the data to  
175 allow themes to emerge through comparisons and interpretations.

## 176 **Ethical consideration**

177 Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the University of Kent, SSPSSR Students  
178 Ethics Committee and AMREF Scientific and Ethics Review Unit in Kenya (Ref: AMREF – ESRC  
179 P537/2018). Further, we received permission to conduct the study from all the healthcare facilities  
180 where the study was conducted and additional clearance to conduct research from the County  
181 Government of Kiambu, Department of Health Services (Ref. No:  
182 KIAMBU/HRDU/AUTHO/2018/10/31/Oyugi B). We also got written informed consent from the  
183 respondents before conducting the interviews, after informing them about the purpose of the study and  
184 their right to withdraw consent at any point. They were also assured of their confidentiality, and that  
185 their data would be reported in an aggregated format, and anonymised to protect their identities,  
186 throughout the course of this study.

187

## 188 **Results**

### 189 **Preliminary situation analysis, setting the priorities, and the** 190 **context of the policy.**

191 The preliminary situation analysis has revealed that the priorities of the policy are linked to  
192 several factors, such as the desired needs of the government and key stakeholders and the need to bridge

193 the gaps from the previous FM policy. These aspects set the context of the policy’s adoption and  
194 implementation.

195 **The government prioritised the FMS policy to reflect and align with the objectives of the**  
196 **country's legal and policy-guiding instruments.** The government sought to align and improve the  
197 coverage of reproductive maternal and neonatal child health (RMNCH) services as reflected in the  
198 Constitution of Kenya, 2010, the Vision 2030 and the Health Sector Strategic and Investment Plan  
199 (HSSP) 2019-2023 [40]. For example, as noted by the respondents, the constitution provided every  
200 citizen with the right to quality health and life (including maternal and neonatal care) [41] while the  
201 social pillar of the Kenya Vision 2030 envisioned a country-wide scale-up of community health high-  
202 impact interventions to strengthen and enhance the implementation of level one MNCH high-impact  
203 intervention services (such as free maternity service) to accelerate initiatives targeting nutrition  
204 services, family planning, immunisation, sanitation and safe motherhood [42]. Besides, the HSSP  
205 envisioned increasing equitable access to care regarding quality and availability of services at all levels  
206 and creating and sustaining demand for improved preventive and promotive healthcare services [43].

207

208 **The need to align with the global goals of achieving sustainable development goals (SDGs).**  
209 Achieving SDGs was seen as a key tenet and foundation that anchored the need for the FMP agenda. It  
210 was noted that while Kenya had made some progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals  
211 (MDGs), the country had missed those targets [44]. Therefore, the policy was triggered by the gaps in  
212 those goals, as well as the desire to achieve the maternal and child health targets in the SDGs:

213 *‘...As previously we had been given the MDGs [Millennium Development Goals], but they didn’t*  
214 *work for the 15 years. So now we are working on the SDGs [Sustainable Development Goals]. So*  
215 *being a healthcare worker we are trying our best to ensure that the country and our county achieves*  
216 *its objective’ – (R003, Nursing Officer).*

217

218 **The need to improve the quality of maternal and neonatal care, by eliminating financial**  
219 **barriers, thereby enhancing access to skilled birth attendance (SBA).** There was an  
220 acknowledgement that the enhanced FMP was an incentive to boost the quality of maternal care, since  
221 most women had inadequate access to SBAs. As noted by the respondents, the Kenya Service

222 Availability and Readiness Assessment survey had showed the existence of sub-standard care in  
223 facilities, and therefore, the enhanced policy was meant to boost maternal and neonatal health, that had  
224 deteriorated in quality within the facilities. In addition, there was the need to eliminate financial barriers  
225 which would enhance access to free maternity services by pregnant women. As perceived, the FMS  
226 policy would address concerns of other barriers of access; such as geographical barriers (ensuring that  
227 the marginalised populations and those in rural areas have equal access); socio-cultural barriers  
228 (ensuring that the use of traditional birth attendants (TBAs) reduces; and service access (ensuring access  
229 to services such as testing at ANCs which were previously unavailable), thereby enhancing the  
230 achievement of UHC:

231 *‘Linda Mama also informs Universal Health Coverage, because Universal Health Coverage seeks*  
232 *to enhance, seeks to embrace access to health care providers.’ – (R034, NHIF Officer).*

233

234 **The desire and urgency to achieve a political campaign agenda.** Some respondents  
235 perceived the FMS policy to be a political tool used by the government to fulfil a campaign agenda, as  
236 captured in the president’s *Jubilee Party 2013 Presidential campaign Manifesto [45]*. Some of the  
237 respondents highlighted that the goal of the policy was to fulfil part of the Big Four agenda that the then  
238 president formulated after his election, and policy makers and implementers had no option but to  
239 implement it:

240 *‘it was used as a political tool...to be able to achieve and acquire power...I can tell you in terms*  
241 *of even conceptualizing the idea implementation, politics played its part, and I think the president*  
242 *announced it in 2013 during, is it Madaraka day [Kenyan public holiday]...so there is always*  
243 *politics behind some of these things...I think it was politically appearing so usually the health*  
244 *workers have no...choice but to actually actualize’ – (R026, Development partner)*

245

246 **The need to include the private sector as the additional implementers of the policy.** There  
247 was the need to rope in the private sector and faith-based organisations (FBOs), who were not  
248 implementers in the previous FM policy. The move was aimed at decongesting public facilities and  
249 giving pregnant women more choice. Further, the move was thought of as being imperative in  
250 improving access in areas, especially arid and semi-arid areas, where there were not many government  
251 facilities, but that had many FBOs offering services. Eventually this would end up improving efficiency:

252 *'...we weren't including private, and as you know private almost takes care of 40% of our*  
253 *population, only 60% more often that uses GOK [Government of Kenya]...there was a feeling that*  
254 *we are leaving a few people behind, especially in Nairobi, where we have more private facilities*  
255 *than public....so that was one of the driving forces, FBOs [Faith Based Organisation] also thought*  
256 *left behind, who are our partners in so many ways....There was also the consideration of the far*  
257 *front [marginalised] areas where there are private and mostly even FBOs and there is no GOK*  
258 *facility around, but there is a lot of FBOs especially in Turkana, so it was thought [important] for*  
259 *us to improve on access and efficiency' – (R032, MoH Official).*

260

261 **The need to have uniformity in the delivery of the maternal service provision under the**  
262 **free maternity policy.** It was perceived that the policy, as implemented, needed to have uniformity of  
263 service provision across the counties (especially those that had launched their own unique service  
264 delivery platforms for their citizens). This would allow citizens from a different county to access  
265 services in another county even if they hadn't registered there. It would enhance competition amongst  
266 counties and reduce the incentive to seek healthcare services in counties that had invested more in their  
267 healthcare services:

268 *So, I guess the structure levelled out the advantage that already developed counties would have in*  
269 *terms of service delivery to their citizens. Because all we need is a card or a registration, it doesn't*  
270 *matter which county you came from, and you will be able to access your care from whichever*  
271 *county you go. That is very different from the roll-out you see in other counties, where a county is*  
272 *rolling out its own program and you can only get that care if you are from [reside? in] that county*  
273 *and are registered as a member of that county. That discrimination also ruled out the advantage*  
274 *of having citizens access care in neighbouring [counties] and not pay for it [as] somebody else*  
275 *pays for it.' – (R010, Facility manager).*

276

277 **The policy was to cover the loss of funding that was previously charged to the mothers for**  
278 **the services, but that would no longer be available.** The facilities needed to continue sustaining the  
279 health facilities costs. However, it was also linked to the need to improve the quality of care from the  
280 reimbursements to the facilities (incentivise the facilities). It was noted that the funds would help  
281 purchase equipment that the government had been unable to provide, motivate staff through incentives,  
282 and employ additional staff:

283 *'You know cost sharing; in the past you know, maternity used to generate cash and now it's zero*  
284 *because it's free and services have to run...I think it's purely because of financial reasons' – (R004,*  
285 *Nursing Officer).*

287 **The policy was addressing the challenges of the previous free maternity policy.** The  
288 implementation challenges experienced in the previous FM policy were perceived as the substantial  
289 reason for the shift to the current *Linda Mama* policy. The respondents at both the national and the  
290 county level referred to the challenges that had been noted by Tama et al. [5] in their process evaluation  
291 process evaluation as: *lack of exhaustive service package* due to inadequate costing of the services; *data*  
292 *problems*, where facilities were using inflated utilisation numbers, rather than mothers' unique  
293 identifiers, to get claims from the MoH that were unverifiable; *poor quality of care*, since patients was  
294 pushed to the public hospitals that were ill-prepared to tackle the high number of mothers because of  
295 inadequate infrastructure. Additionally, there was a *lack of or inadequate communication* of the policy  
296 at the grassroot level, which led to poor clarity of the content of the policy, and *disappointed and*  
297 *dissatisfied clients* with the services. The respondents noted that the work was overwhelming to the  
298 MoH Department of policy and planning, and reproductive health, which did not have the capacity to  
299 manage both the payments and the services:

300 *'Data fraud, issues about data verification, data validation to be able to monitor the utilization*  
301 *rate, second the issue of disbursement of money, proper disbursement of money from the Ministry*  
302 *of Health to the health facilities, thirdly is the fact that private sector was left out.'* – (R029,  
303 *Development Partner)*

304

## 305 **The processes of formulation of the free maternity policy**

306 **The private sector network had a significant interest in the policy formulation phase.** The  
307 justification of the inclusion of the private sector by the private sector networks and negotiation on the  
308 pricing characterised the discussions at the formulation stage. For instance, in using previously  
309 conducted research, the networks observed that the developed systems in the private sector would ease  
310 the previous FMP implementation challenges in the public sector. As such, the networks opted to push  
311 the private sector agenda of their inclusion through the national and county leaderships (using the

312 success of the programs they had implemented prior, such as leveraging their network of community  
313 health volunteers which would make them favourable when the policy was finally rolled out). Besides,  
314 through their established interests and strengths, as soon as the policy had been formulated, they worked  
315 with their networks of private health facilities for advanced accreditation using internal quality of health  
316 standards and guidelines before the actual Linda Mama accreditation. They also communicated the  
317 packages of the policy in advance to their network of hospitals:

318 *‘...we gave our input at the National level, but also, we realized that we needed to do some*  
319 *groundwork at the County level, because these are two independent Governments...so at the MOH*  
320 *level, so we went out to the CHMT’s [County Health Management Team] at the community level*  
321 *and just made them understand what we are trying to do and why this is important and why they*  
322 *should support us, for them to be able to deliver on free maternity care through the private sector.*  
323 *And so, what we saw the CHMT’s do is that they attached themselves to our teams and they did*  
324 *routine supportive supervision with us on a sampling basis just to ensure that what we were telling*  
325 *them was what was on the ground’ – (R030, Development partner).*

326  
327 The perspective from the private sector network was that the NHIF could not manage (lead) the  
328 extensive quality of service that the private sector, the Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO) and  
329 the Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) had achieved so far because their reimbursements were perceived  
330 as unattractive. The NGO and FBOs were keen to join the policy scheme but proposed that the  
331 government raise the reimbursement cost. The concern was that their investment in infrastructure and  
332 other additional costs, such as rent and staff, was high:

333 *‘Within our...400 plus providers....NHIF cannot manage that quality...you see there are so many*  
334 *things, it’s [the policy] creating access, and it’s creating equity in term of it reaching the poor...not*  
335 *so many people appreciate it because it’s not attractive in terms of profit but there are a lot of*  
336 *private sectors that are actually improving on that... we are not saying you put it at 10000/= [USD*  
337 *95.9], we are saying put it at 6000/= [USD 57.5] there will be demand and they will increase. And*  
338 *then contract other facilities to support you, contract other quality organizations like PSI, MSI who*  
339 *are known for quality in terms of SRH to support the Government in terms of quality.’ – (R029,*  
340 *Development partner).*

341  
342 **The costing of the policy at the formulation stage was done using the projections of**  
343 **maternal indicators and funding ascertained.** The policy was conceived as an insurance package

344 allowing mothers to use the registration card, guarantee maternal care for up to a year after birth and  
345 transition to an NHIF card for outpatient and inpatient services at their facilities of choice. The three  
346 bases of costing at the formulation were that a) health is a free good, b) the need for introducing  
347 sustainability in developing the provision of maternal care, and c) the expected number of deliveries  
348 given the demographic characteristics of the mothers. It was estimated that there would be almost 1 to  
349 1.2 million mothers delivering in the country every year, with a conservative estimate of 25% being  
350 insured by entities other than NHIF. Eventually, the FM policy would reach 700,000 mothers by the  
351 first year of roll-up, who, after having utilised the services and seen the value of it, would be attracted  
352 to it as some form of insurance. Consequently, it was further envisaged that 25% of those who use the  
353 free policy services, especially those in quantiles 1 and 2, could transition to full insurance after the  
354 expiry of *Linda Mama* and start paying for it. The formulation idea was that – in the following years of  
355 the policy – with the mothers in quantiles 1,2, and 3 paying a monthly contribution fee to the NHIF for  
356 themselves, it would ease pressure on the treasury fund meant for the policy. Additionally, there was a  
357 projection of the prospective number of both vaginal and caesarean deliveries that was envisaged, with  
358 the assumption that 15-20% of the deliveries would complicate:

359 *‘So, all those were projected, the caesarean section how many do were expected, close to 10%,*  
360 *15%, the normal ones...’ – (R032, MoH Official) and ‘...when the fund was being put in place, it*  
361 *was assumed that at least fifteen to twenty percent would complicate [result to a complication].*  
362 *So, they will be catered for by everything else.’ – (R024, MoH Official).*

363  
364 The overall projection cost of the policy was estimated at KES 6.5 billion (USD 62.3 million)  
365 (Exchange rate, 1 USD = KES 104.32, which was the rate as of 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017 at the initiation of the  
366 first phase of the implementation of policy (from <https://www1.oanda.com/currency/converter/>), but  
367 the national treasury allocated the MoH KES 4.2 billion (USD 43.1 million) which the respondent  
368 deemed sufficient to meet the need.

369 Further, the funding source for the policy was ascertained. Unlike the previous policy, co-  
370 funded by the development partners (JICA and The World Bank), the *Linda Mama* policy was mainly  
371 conceived as tax-funded by the national government. However, the respondents noted that there was no  
372 specifically earmarked funding for the policy.

373 *'It is largely funded by our taxes...and they are not earmarked, so that means that they could easily*  
374 *be rerouted somewhere else.'* – (R023, MoH Official)

375

376 **There was general perception that the costing had not been done in a consultative manner**  
377 **as should be the norm.** While the majority of the national-level stakeholders perceived [argued/felt]  
378 that the policy had been sufficiently costed including assessing its sustainability, others felt that the  
379 program had been arbitrarily costed and had made many costly assumptions:

380 *'...we cost it according to what we spend and then we put an arbitrary amount for miscellaneous,*  
381 *we are not thinking of what is the cost-benefit of this like can you relate every cost you put in, like*  
382 *for a hundred bob we put into healthcare, how many maternal deaths are averted...we don't know*  
383 *why; we cannot justify why we put a mark of four billion at least scientifically'* – (R023, MoH  
384 **Official)**

385

386 Consequently, the respondents at the meso level felt that the costing was somewhat dubious  
387 based on the implementation experience that had left them with more costs to absorb from the service  
388 provision:

389 *'You don't know how the figures of reimbursement were arrived at and noting that every county is*  
390 *a market in its own way, with its own influencers of supply, demand and price. Giving one cut line*  
391 *of a price disadvantages those counties where services are provided at a higher cost compared to*  
392 *counties where services are provided at a lower cost. So, for you to remain in the system you had*  
393 *to absorb some cost and absorbing the cost [would mean] you have a loss. And again, with coming*  
394 *to be like a revenue loss for the county to keep on reimbursing services for which their people are*  
395 *asking for but for which the money funding is not adequate per case.'* – (R010, Facility incharge)

396

397 **NHIF was chosen as the ultimate purchaser of services.** at the formulation stage, the NHIF  
398 was the agency proposed to run the FM fund, as it had the technical and institutional capacity to manage  
399 such funds based on its experience. There was no other consideration of transitioning the policy to other  
400 organisations other than the NHIF. The majority of the respondents believed that NHIF was undergoing  
401 reforms at the time aimed at transitioning to UHC; hence, had better accountability structures.  
402 Additionally, NHIF had existing structures and networks of facilities across the country that could be  
403 leveraged instead of creating a different program. Besides, NHIF had already been working with the  
404 private sector, hence, it was easy to attract and enroll many facilities. The plan, therefore, was to utilise



405 NHIF instruments to track elements such as average length of stay, quality of care, access, fraud,  
406 complaint system and payment of providers:

407 *'No there were no other options...[be]cause [with] Linda mama...we wanted really to involve the*  
408 *low-cost privates to improve the access to mothers which we would not have done as MOH*  
409 *[be]cause MOH can't pay money to private but the law allows NHIF to pay to do that. So that was*  
410 *one of the driving force[s]. NHIF can pay private I mean they have contracts with them, so it was*  
411 *easy we weren't going to start something new' – (R032, MoH Official).*

412

413 While some respondents felt that there were no legal hurdles in working with the NHIF – a  
414 semi-autonomous agency under the MoH – document review revealed that civil society organisations  
415 had been pushing the narrative of the illegality of the process (see, KELIN Kenya [46]). Additionally,  
416 engaging the NHIF would remove the challenge of returning unconsumed money to the treasury as was  
417 the norm when the MoH managed the program during the previous policy. The process would allow  
418 for exhaustive use of the finance allocated for the project in the rolling years:

419 *'So, what happens when the money is within the ministry of health, when the financial year comes*  
420 *to the end, that money goes back to national treasury, through the process, the government*  
421 *budgeting process and it is availed again the following financial year. So in such a scenario where*  
422 *now it goes to NHIF such a body corporate, that money does not have to go back and perhaps if*  
423 *there are pending reimbursements like for instance if I am doing reimbursements for the last*  
424 *quarter of the financial year, April, May, June, and you see like for end of June or end of May, the*  
425 *facilities have to report, then it is compiled, then it is paid, which means it will be paid post, the*  
426 *financial year is ended and the money will already have gotten back. So, they won't be paying for*  
427 *that period. So that kind of challenges they required an institution that can be able to handle that'*  
428 *– (R024, MoH Official)*

429

430 **The implementation manuals and guidelines were agreed upon at the formulation stage**  
431 **but there were gaps in the monitoring the resulting quality of maternal care from the policy.** The  
432 formulation committee developed a policy document and a concept note which were eventually taken  
433 to the Cabinet for approval. In addition, an implementation manual and a communication strategy were  
434 also developed.

435 To kickstart the process of implementation, a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between  
436 the MoH and the NHIF was signed. Correspondingly, financial guidelines were also developed but it

437 was envisaged that the HCWs would rely on the clinical and service provision guidelines that were in  
438 use prior to the policy. Notwithstanding that the MoH, through the department of quality standards  
439 developed the Kenya Quality Model of Health (KQMH) to provide structured support to counties for  
440 general QoC, there was no other guideline on quality maternal care developed at the formulation of the  
441 policy, as noted by respondents. There was a feeling that the little attention was being paid to quality  
442 guidelines but more on the implementation. The private organisations and development partners  
443 proposed to fill up the gap in quality through their own project such as *safe care* which trains and  
444 teaches the staff in the facilities on improvement of quality:

445 *‘MOU with the ministry whereby we looked at how to bring in a bit of technology to assist in the*  
446 *registration of women so that through NHIF system we are able to register first, once you register,*  
447 *the next step is that there has to be a confirmation of pregnancy. So, we signed an MOU on what*  
448 *will be our roles in line with the implementation of this product’ – (R025, NHIF Official)*

449  
450 *‘...not squarely on the government, but thanks to development partners and private entities...there*  
451 *are very clear projects or approaches that come into address some of these gaps that are identified.*  
452 *So, I say the facilities are willing, but it only works where they have development partners’ – (R035,*  
453 *Development partner)*

454

455

## 456 **The Content of the policy**

457 **The envisaged design envisioned inclusive benefit packages, more infrastructure, and human**  
458 **resources.** The envisioned package cuts across maternal care from ANC, delivery, to PNC care,  
459 complications and referral services. Furthermore, it was envisaged to take care of the infant within the  
460 one-year period in the program (see Fig 1). Further, at the formulation, it was projected that the  
461 workload would increase, requiring more investment in infrastructure and human resource:

462 *‘We did not go into those details but we also said as a, the government need to invest on human*  
463 *resources, we are anticipating some increases in human resources, I mean increases in workload, I*  
464 *think that should be followed by investment in human resources, investments in commodities and*  
465 *also even infrastructure, other infrastructures, renovation of the maternity wards, those were things*  
466 *that we had anticipated and we recommended investments in those areas as to whether that*  
467 *happened is a different issue.’ – (R026, Development partner)*

468

469 As further noted by *R026, Development partner*, ‘...the transport element was not factored in’ at  
470 the formulation hence mothers would spend money on transport. At the formulation stage, the  
471 envisioned reimbursement of the scheme was as shown in Fig 2.

472

473 [INSERT Fig 1 HERE]

474 *Fig 1: Benefit packages for Linda mama. (Source: Adopted from Implementation manual for program*  
475 *managers[47])*

476

477 [INSERT Fig 2 HERE]

478 *Fig 2: Reimbursement rates (Source: Adopted from Implementation manual for program*  
479 *managers[47])*

480

## 481 **Roles of the stakeholders in the formulation and the** 482 **implementation**

483 **A committee of stakeholders was set up to discuss the policy formulation agenda.** the key  
484 informants noted that at the formulation of the current policy, the MoH set up a committee bringing  
485 together a mix of stakeholders (such as development partners, the MoH representatives, and NHIF  
486 officials) which developed a concept note (comprehensive implementation document on how Linda  
487 Mama would look like) to review the whole FM policy process and share tasks.

488 **Different stakeholders played different roles in the policy formulation stage.** Obtained  
489 from document reviews and IDIs, *Table 3* and *Table 5* summarises the actors who participated in the  
490 policy formulation and their roles. Characteristically, the influential participants at the formulation stage  
491 were the development partners (The World Bank, WHO, JICA, UNFPA, and USAID), who all  
492 supported the initial technical design. Of all the partners, the World Bank and JICA were most involved,  
493 as they were the co-founders of the previous FM policy. At the national level, the Presidency outlined  
494 the agenda; the appointed officials at the National Treasury allocated the budget; and the MoH, through

495 the Principal Secretary (PS) and the director general's (DG) office provided oversight. Interestingly,  
496 while FM policy was targeted at improving maternal and reproductive health, the members of the MoH  
497 reproductive health department felt that they were not adequately involved as noted by some  
498 respondents:

499 *'but not the team from the reproductive health stakeholders, they have not been largely involved, I*  
500 *mean, that is why I was saying we are all in the dark like facilities.'* – **(R023, MoH Official)**.

501

502 Equally, despite the policy aimed at improving the QoC provision of maternal care, the MoH  
503 players managing the quality and standards felt they were not adequately included as noted by some  
504 respondents:

505 *'that the players who are charged with quality just need to be roped in.'* – **(R034, MoH Official)**

506

507 The other players involved included the Council of Governors (CoG), which provided the  
508 modalities of implementation at the counties; the NHIF as the chosen purchaser of the fund, which  
509 provided implementation framework; the member of religious interest groups, private sector alliance  
510 interest group, and workers unions. Population Services International (PSI) was one of the international  
511 NGOs included in the process, which focused on persuading the committee to empanel the private  
512 sector facilities especially those they worked with to improve access in the informal settlements.

513 From the document review, the civil society and the beneficiaries (individual citizens and  
514 HCWs from both the private and the public sector) were involved through community forums.  
515 However, there was feeling that the mothers or their representatives, some county officials and the  
516 healthcare workers may not have been involved and did not know about the policy:

517 *'Involved? You know now, okay the change I would talk about is maybe they start involving us*  
518 *the people on the ground'* – **(R014, Nursing Officer)**

519 *'I: Were you involved in the design of the free maternity of the Linda Mama? R: No'* – **(R016,**  
520 **County level manager)**

521

522 *There was a different organizational arrangement and role of actors in implementation.* The  
523 analysis showed that implementation of the FM policy took a top-down approach in three levels: the

524 national, county, and facility levels (Fig 3). There were more actors in the implementation than the  
525 formulation.

526

527 [INSERT Fig 3 HERE]

528 *Fig 3: implementation arrangement of the free maternity policy as it is being implemented (source:*  
529 *document review and interviews)*

530

531 **In the arrangement, there was a joined-up government at the centre (national level).** The  
532 policy imperatives emerging from the national level were de facto priorities of the government as  
533 captured in the president's *2017 Jubilee campaign Manifesto* [45]. At the national level, The  
534 Presidency, development partners, NHIF, MoH, The National Treasury, Office of the Auditor General,  
535 the CoG and the Parliament were joined up in what Exworthy and Powel [48] call 'horizontal dimension  
536 – joined-up government at the centre' and performed a multiplicity of implementation roles as shown  
537 in *Table 3* and *Table 5*. MoH was a powerful and influential actor at the national level. Three entities  
538 in MoH: Cabinet Secretary (CS) Health, PS health, and DG Health, were strategic policy experts, who  
539 sourced funds from the National Treasury and provided strategic, future policy direction in line with  
540 the presidential directive of UHC (*Table 4*).

541 In terms of a governance structure, it was shown that it was imperative to have a proper  
542 reporting structure at the national level that would monitor the implementation of the program.  
543 However, there was a breakdown in the reporting channels that led to a gap at the national level. The  
544 effect was that the PS, who represented the MoH, would be receiving many communications concerning  
545 challenges of implementation from several sources which sometimes may have been incorrect. At MoH,  
546 the implementation was overseen by the equally powerful and influential department of preventative  
547 and promotive health (Division of Family Health), together with the NHIF, they have provided adequate  
548 social marketing to the policy through social mobilisation and communication of the providers and  
549 beneficiaries. Also, upon receiving claims and utilisation reports from the NHIF, the MoH was able to  
550 track the level of remaining funds in the pot and mobilises additional reports from the National treasury.  
551 However, the team from division of family health at MoH – despite being concerned with the

552 reproductive health – was not involved in the formulation but passively participate in the  
553 implementation as noted by one respondent:

554 *‘...but not the team from the reproductive health stakeholders, they have not been largely involved’*  
555 *– (R023, MoH Official).*

556

557 Other departments at the MoH that were less powerful and had a medium level of interest were  
558 the division of health policy and planning, division of healthcare financing, standards and quality  
559 assurance and regulations, and monitoring and evaluation unit. The units provided strategic policy  
560 direction to the NHIF on their areas of strength and concern.

561 Similarly, the national treasury played a critical role but had a less influential role in the  
562 implementation process of the policy; however, they liaised with the parliament to approve the required  
563 budget for the policy. Since the introduction of the policy, they were able to provide the funds as  
564 required. Besides linking with the MOH, the National Treasury linked with the county treasury to  
565 provide other statutory funds not necessarily linked to the running of FM policy.

566 Equally, the NHIF was a powerful actor drawing from its mandate as an overall overseer of  
567 implementation of FM policy – as a managed fund under its department of programs and schemes –  
568 and primary purchaser of services. As a purchaser, the NHIF used its extensive network with service  
569 providers to accredit and contract providers – not previously registered on their system – for FM policy  
570 services provision. The NHIF timely reimbursed the providers for services rendered through its  
571 automated database for registration and authentication of beneficiaries. Using government ID numbers,  
572 NHIF verified the claims and redressed any complains arising from the providers on the mothers served.  
573 The NHIF had the mandate to report the claims and utilisation data for service provided, which was  
574 then yearly audited by the influential office of the auditor general. Besides, auditing the reports, the  
575 office of the auditor general was not concerned with the daily running of the implementation process.

576 The development partners, equally played critical roles role in the implementation such as  
577 developing financing strategies, demand generation, capacity building, and collaborations as noted by  
578 the respondents:

579 *'We do capacity building at the provider level.... it's important that both the public and private*  
580 *understand the process of claim because of accreditation, process of contracting, understand issues*  
581 *to do with strategic purchasing in terms of .... service, how do they pay, how do they select just the*  
582 *whole aspect. Demand generation is one of our key aspects in terms of creation awareness.'* –  
583 **(R029, Development partner)**

584  
585 *'We were working with NHIF to help them first of all package their informal sector product'* –  
586 **(R030, Development partner)**

587  
588 Still, at the national level, there were two other key players: the advisory panel, researchers and  
589 advocacy team, that were less influential in the process of implementation of the policy but played an  
590 important role. The advisory panel was developed by the minister of health, albeit late in the  
591 implementation process (on 18th April 2019) in line with the Health Act of reforming and repositioning  
592 the NHIF as a strategic purchaser [49]. The team comprised the development partners, private sector,  
593 researchers, government technocrats, and advocacy coalition teams and their role was to provide the  
594 technical and financial support for NHIF, part of which is management and implementation of the  
595 NHIF. On the other hand, the researchers, mostly research institutions, and the advocacy teams, mostly  
596 the civil society, were working independently or together with the NHIF to link the activities at the  
597 county and facility levels to the national priorities, participated in the process monitoring and  
598 evaluation, provided advocacy especially of the weak and vulnerable such as adolescents, and scientific  
599 publication which were meant to improve knowledge.

600 **Further in the arrangement, there was a joined-up governance at the periphery.** At the  
601 county level, several players worked towards the implementation of *Linda Mama* as one respondent  
602 noted: *'...it's almost everyone, it's like a teamwork'* – **(R004, Nursing Officer)**. The two key ministries  
603 at the county that played the biggest roles in the implementation process are the treasury and health.  
604 The county treasury was concerned with receiving finance from the national treasury and providing  
605 financial support and monitoring the flow of funds at the County Revenue Fund (CRF). On the other  
606 hand, the members of the MoH at the county who oversaw the implementation of the policy form the  
607 County Health Management Team (CHMT) and were composed of several dockets such as nursing,  
608 clinical services, monitoring and evaluation, research and development, pharmacy and administration.

609 The dockets report to the county executive officer (CEC) of Health. Overall, the county governor  
610 *[oversaw] all the activities in the county, like especially in such free maternal its working and*  
611 *supervision.’ – (R009, Nursing Officer).*

612 However, as part of the CHMT, the most influential and active player in the implementation of  
613 the *Linda Mama* policy at the county was the chief officers of health as noted by the respondents:

614 *‘So now our relationship to the county is probably linked to the chief officer, through the chief*  
615 *officer. Because if we have issues with the implementation, then we are supposed to address them*  
616 *to the chief. But other people we don’t know because we don’t really see them.’ – (R005, Facility*  
617 *incharge)*

618

619 The county adopted the UHC agenda of the central government by employing a county focal  
620 person for NHIF, who was important but less influential player and had a role in *‘moving forward not*  
621 *just with NHIF but the UHC goals of Kiambu County as a whole’ – (R017, County level manager).*

622 The regional offices of the NHIF at the county also played a significant role of receiving, batching, and  
623 quality assurance check of all the claims from the facilities in the county and sending to the national  
624 offices.

625 At the service provider level, there were two kinds of providers: the private and the public  
626 providers, who provided services that were responsive to needs of clients and in line with contracted  
627 terms. The public providers were part of the previous FMS that was run before while the private sector  
628 joined the service in 2017 when the new service was moved to the NHIF. They all provided the service  
629 delivery as per the benefit package and reporting of services:

630 *“I will say that the hierarchy and the organogram of hospital management kicks into play any time*  
631 *there is an issue that touches on the hospital, whether it’s Linda Mama or any other thing. We*  
632 *don’t have separated organs to deal with Linda Mama outside other operational issues.” – (R010,*  
633 *Facility incharge).*

634

635 Finally, the most interested but less powerful stakeholders were the beneficiaries. They were  
636 responsible for registering with the NHIF either through self-registration or HCWs assisted, utilised  
637 services and provided feedback. A summary of all roles, interests and power are in *Table 3, Table 4 ,*  
638 *and Table 5.*





640 *Table 3: Actors roles, interest, influences and position on the formulation and implementation process of the free maternity policy.*

	<b>Category of actors</b>	<b>Role in formulation</b>	<b>Role in implementation</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Level of power</b>	<b>Position</b>
<b>Elected officials</b>	The Presidency	+	+	High	High	Supportive
	The members of parliament and senate	No	+	Low	Low	Middle support
	County Governor	No	+++	Medium	High	Middle support
	Member of county assembly	No	+	High	High	Middle support
<b>Appointed officials/offices</b>	Office of the Auditor General	No	+	Low	Low	Middle support
	Council of Governors	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	The National Treasury	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	Cabinet secretary, Principal secretary for health, and Director General (National)	+++	++	High	High	Supportive
	MoH-Department of policy, planning and health Financing (Division of Health Policy and planning and division of healthcare financing) (National)	+	+	Medium	Medium	Supportive
	MoH-Department of preventative and promotive health (Division of Family Health) (National)	+	+++	High	High	Supportive
	MoH-Other departments and divisions (Standards and quality assurance and regulations, M and E)	+	+	Medium	Medium	Middle support
	County Executive Committee (CEC) – Health	No	+	Medium	High	Supportive
	County Chief officer of health (County)	No	+++	High	High	Supportive
	The summit ((CHMT) County directors of Health, Administration and planning and their deputies)	No	+++	High	Medium	Supportive
	The County Treasury (Includes County accountants)	No	+++	Medium	Medium	Supportive
	County NHIF focal person	No	+++	High	Low	Supportive

<b>Purchaser of health services</b>	NHIF (National level)	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	NHIF (County offices)	No	+++	High	Medium	Supportive
<b>Member of interest groups</b>	The Church (SUPKEM, Council of churches)	+	+	Medium	High	Supportive
	The Kenya Private Sector Alliance	++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	HCWs Unions	++	+++	High	High	Supportive
<b>Donors and development partners</b>	The World Bank	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	WHO	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	JICA	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	UN agencies (UNFPA)	+	++	High	Medium	Supportive
	AMREF	+	++	High	High	Supportive
	USAID	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	Marie Stopes International	+	+++	High	Low	Supportive
	Population service International	+	+++	High	Low	Supportive
	PharmAccess	+	+++	High	Low	Supportive
<b>Civil society</b>	Kenya Human Rights Commission	+	+	Low	Low	Immobilised
	KELiN	+	No	Low	Low	Immobilised
	Centre for Reproductive Rights	No	+	Low	Low	Middle support
<b>Beneficiaries</b>	Individual citizens (Men and women)	+	+++	High	Low	Supportive
	Private health facilities	+++	+++	High	High	Supportive
	Public health facilities	+	+++	High	Medium	Supportive
<b>Academia and researchers</b>	Kemri Wellcome Trust	No	++	High	Medium	Supportive
	Population Council	No	+	Medium	Low	Middle support
	Mannion Daniels and Options Consultancy	No	+	Medium	Low	Middle support
	ThinkWell	No	+	High	Low	Middle support
<b>Media</b>	Local and international media	++	+++	High	High	Supportive

<b>Other</b>	Beyond Zero	No	+++	High	High	Supportive
	Jacaranda Health	No	+++	High	Low	Supportive
	Philips	No	++	High	Low	Supportive
	AfyaTu	No	+	High	Low	Supportive
<b>Key:</b>	+++ : Very good involvement; ++ : Good involvement; + : Partial or weak involvement; No: no evidence of involvement.					

641 Source: Author, extracted from a review of documents (**Note:** It is plausible that some actors may have been omitted because they were not apparent in the document reviews  
642 or the IDIs, KIIs, or EIs.)

643 *Table 4: Force field analysis map showing the level of influence and power of actors.*

Level of power	Proponent				Opponents		
	High support	Middle	Low	Non mobilised	Low	Middle	High opposition
High	The Presidency	County Governor					
	Council of Governors	Member of county assembly					
	The National Treasury						
	Cabinet secretary, Principal secretary for health, and Director General (National)						
	MoH-Department of preventative and promotive health (Division of Family Health) (National)						
	County Executive Committee (CEC) – Health						
	County Chief officer of health (County)						
	NHIF (National level)						
	The Church (SUPKEM, Council of churches)						
	The Kenya Private Sector Alliance						
	HCWs Unions						
	The World Bank						
	WHO						
	JICA						
	AMREF						
	USAID						
	Private health facilities						
Local and international media							
Beyond Zero							
Medium	MoH-Department of policy, planning and health Financing (Division of Health Policy and planning and	MoH-Other departments and divisions (Standards and quality assurance and regulations, M and E)					

Level of power	Proponent			Non mobilised	Opponents		
	High support	Middle	Low		Low	Middle	High opposition
	division of healthcare financing) (National)						
	The summit ((CHMT) County directors of Health, Administration and planning and their deputies)						
	The County Treasury (Includes County accountants)						
	NHIF (County offices)						
	UN agencies (UNFPA)						
	Public health facilities						
	Kemri Wellcome Trust						
Low	County NHIF focal person	The members of parliament and senators			Kenya Human Rights Commission		
	Marie Stopes International	Office of the Auditor General			KELiN		
	Population service International	Centre for Reproductive Rights					
	Individual citizens (Men and women)	Population Council					
	Jacaranda Health	Mannion Daniels and Options Consultancy					
	Philips	ThinkWell					
	CHS						

Source: Author, extracted from a review of documents (*Note: It is plausible that some actors may have been omitted because they were not apparent in the document reviews or the IDIs, KIIs, or EIs.*)

644  
645  
646

647 *Table 5: Role of the actors*

	<b>Category of actors</b>	<b>Role in formulation</b>	<b>Role in implementation</b>
<b>Elected officials</b>	The Presidency	Outlining the <i>Jubilee Agenda</i>	- Outlining the <i>Jubilee Agenda</i> .
	The members of parliament and senators	No	- Approving the government spending on Linda mama.
	County Governor	No	- Supervision of the CHMT for service provision and financial allocation. - Working in collaboration with other similar projects that are targeted at achieving UHC.
	Member of county assembly	No	- Working with the pregnant mothers who provide feedback about the services received.
<b>Appointed officials/offices</b>	Office of the Auditor General	No	- Statutory audit of FM policy reports.
	Council of Governors	- Supporting initial technical design (technical capacity) - Modalities of implementation at the county level	- Collaborating with the counties to form council of health ministers from the counties to ensure efficient implementation of the policy at the county level.
	The National Treasury	- Resource and budgetary costing	- Resource and budgetary allocation.
	Cabinet secretary, Principal secretary for health, and Director General (National)	- Oversight of the discussion and direction - Overseeing the implementation of the previous Linda mama Services and transition from the previous FMS to the current Linda Mama	- Providing funds to the NHIF. - Source for funds from the National Treasury and provides strategic, future policy direction in line with the presidential directive of UHC.
	MoH-Department of policy, planning and health Financing (Division of Health Policy and planning and division of healthcare financing) (National)	- Limited involvement except advisory	- Limited involvement. - Advisory on Health financing strategies not linked to Linda mama.
MoH-Department of preventative and promotive health (Division of Family Health) (National)	- Limited involvement except advisory	- Providing the overall oversight of the implementation of Linda mama (Providing the technical lead on behalf of MoH). - Monitoring and evaluation of the progress of implementation of UHC for which Linda mama is part.	

	MoH-Other departments and divisions (Standards and quality assurance and regulations, M and E)	- Limited involvement except advisory	- Limited involvement except advisory.
	County Executive Committee (CEC) – Health	No	- Coordinates health services at the county.
	County Chief officer of health (County)	No	- Hands on in overseeing the implementation of Linda mama at the county level.
	The summit ((CHMT) County directors of Health, Administration and planning and their deputies)	No	- Supervision of the policy outcome. - Providing continuity of supplies and supporting the referral system. - Communication of the policy to the healthcare workers - Employment of the clerks and supervising them.
	The County Treasury (Includes County accountants)	No	- Providing approvals to the facilities to spend the cash. - Accountant oversees financial operations.
	County NHIF focal person	No	- County NHIF point person who streamlining the hospital accounts and making sure they do the right things. - Overseeing the UHC project for which the Linda mama is part. - Linking with the Beyond zero project to ensure free camps maternal camps are carried out.
	Hospital employees (HRIO, NHIF clerk, In charges, Administrators, Other HCWs)	No	- Provide services to the Clients and supporting in their registration.
<b>Purchaser of health services</b>	NHIF (National level)	- Supporting initial technical design (technical capacity) - Came up with ways of improving coverage (issuing cards and setting up offices in the hospital)	- Overall management of Linda mama. - Creating demand and providing awareness / educating the mothers. - Registration of the members and providing the services.
	NHIF (County offices)	No	- Batching of claims form all hospitals in the county.
<b>Member of interest</b>	The Church (SUPKEM, Council of churches)	- Provide support on the implementation strategy and the duality of it.	- Educating the congregations on FM policy.



<b>groups</b>		- Provide input from members	
	The Kenya Private Sector Alliance	- Provide support on the implementation strategy and the duality of it. - Provide input from members	- Provide support on the implementation strategy and the duality of it.
	HCWs Unions	- Provide support on the implementation strategy and the duality of it. - Provide input from members	- Critiquing the government's implementation process.
<b>Donors and development partners</b>	The World Bank	- Funding the initial initiative - Supporting initial technical design (technical capacity) - Part of the technical working group discussing the movement	- Participating in the discussions around health reforms in Kenya for which Linda mama is part.
	WHO	- Supporting initial technical design (technical capacity)	- Evaluate the legal access rights to health care through independent consultants.
	JICA	- Supporting initial technical design (technical capacity)	- Fostering partnerships for UHC.
	UN agencies (UNFPA)	- Advocating for inclusion of a broad spectrum of services	- Supporting the MoH to develop the policy and plans and documents.
	AMREF	(+)	- Engaging the extensive network of community health volunteers and beyond zero to register mothers in the program.
	USAID	- Supporting initial technical design (technical capacity) - Transitioning from the FMS to Linda mama - Supporting the launch of Linda mama through a report	- Directly working with the facilities to enhance the QoC, investing in human resource, investing in supplies and commodities. - Supporting in development of the policies, more so health financing policies. - Working with counties to improve their efficiency in utilisation of the available resources and other resource allocation (PFM act). - Advocacy for increasing resources. - Supporting the District health Information System, and data quality assurance (DQS) in hospitals.
	DANIDA		- Providing equitable fund to improve facilities

	Marie Stopes International	(+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity building of the provider level for both private and public providers on claim process, accreditation, process of contracting.</li> <li>- Demand creation by creating awareness of the policy to the community.</li> <li>- Support the government in achieving UHC.</li> </ul>
	Population Service International	- Discussion with the NHIF on the importance of working with the private sector in informal settlements (more so small and middle-level health facilities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through AHME, working with NHIF to package benefit for the informal sector.</li> <li>- Capacity building/ professional competency/ continuous medical education of the providers.</li> <li>- Monitoring and evaluation/ supervision to ensure quality is adhered.</li> <li>- Demand creation by creating awareness of the policy to the community.</li> <li>- Ensuring that the registered facilities are properly licenced by the professional bodies such as NCK, Clinical officers board, KMPDB.</li> <li>- Conduct their own quality checks in the facility before empanelling to ensuring hospitals have beds, referral equipment; and safecare program for 6-12 months before empanelling so accreditation is guaranteed.</li> </ul>
<b>Civil society</b>	Kenya National Commission on Human Rights	- A review of implementation of programs including FM policy	- A review of implementation of programs including FM policy.
	KELiN	No	- Providing legal critique of hinging Linda Mama under NHIF.
	Centre for Reproductive Rights	No	- Documenting abuse and disrespect in maternal health setting.
<b>Beneficiaries</b>	Individual citizens (Men and women)	- Involvement of the community in forums and at the launch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registering for the service (self-registration or HCW supported).</li> <li>- Benefiting/utilising the services.</li> </ul>
	Private health facilities	- Discussion about reimbursement strategies and rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of the service to the beneficiaries</li> <li>- Reporting the outcomes.</li> </ul>
	Public health facilities	- Providing feedback from the previous FMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of the service to the beneficiaries</li> <li>- Reporting the outcomes.</li> </ul>

<b>Academia and researchers</b>	Kemri Wellcome Trust	No	- Working with ThinkWell and NHIF to conduct process evaluation of Linda mama.
	Population Council	No	- Impact evaluation of removal of fee for FM policy on UHC.
	Mannion Daniels and Options Consultancy	No	- Evaluating a case study of implementing Linda Mama in Kenya Bungoma County.
	ThinkWell	No	- Working with Kemri Wellcome Trust and NHIF to conduct process evaluation of Linda mama.
<b>Media</b>	Local and international media	No	- Participate in media coverage of progress and critiquing the government where there is no progress.
<b>Other</b>	Beyond Zero	No	- Engaging the county governments and the NHIF to do a mobile clinic campaign encouraging mothers to register with NHIF and access Linda mama. - Work with like-minded programs and organisation to support maternal care.
	Jacaranda Health	No	- Coordinating with the healthcare facilities to conduct health care education and training nurses on the care for patients. - Evaluating satisfaction of client on the services provided.
	Philips	No	- Develop innovation and digital solutions for Maternal and Child Health such as Digital labour and delivery solution (DLDS) and Mobile Obstetric Monitoring (MOM).
	CHS	No	- Employing PMTCT nurse in maternity.
	Aphia Plus	No	- Training staff on provision of quality care; providing equipment and supplies for maternal care.
<b>KEY:</b>	(+) : there is participation, but the interviewees could not reveal; (-) : there is participation from document review but not outrightly stated; ? : In depth interviews and document review could not reveal any evidence of the role		

648  
649

*Author, extracted from a review of documents (Note: It is plausible that some actors may have been omitted because they were not apparent in the document reviews or the IDIs, KIIs, or EIs.)*

## 650 Discussion

651 This study set out to explore the process of agenda setting and policy formulation of the  
652 expanded LM policy in Kenya. Chiefly, one observation emerging from exploring the background of  
653 the policy is that it was a political initiative (guided by political campaign promises and the country's  
654 legal and policy-guiding instruments) aimed at attaining both international (SDGs) and national goals  
655 (achieving UHC and improving access to SBA). It also sought to build on and bridge the gaps and  
656 inefficiencies of the previous FM policy implemented in 2013. This preliminary situation analysis  
657 shows that the adoption /formulation of this policy followed the opening of a 'window of opportunity',  
658 when a confluence of ideas and opportunities merged at the opportune time, as noted by Kingdon [50].  
659 The confluence integrated three things: the political value of agenda-setting on such policy reforms as  
660 highlighted by Gilson et al.:[51] the need for setting the priority of policy agenda to meet national and  
661 international goals as shown by Meessen et al.:[52] and the consistency of building on FM policy that  
662 was already in the policy agenda. Further, by building on the lessons from the previous FM policy, the  
663 policy is taking the ebbs and flows fluid process instead of remaining in a fixed static form. This  
664 observation of the background of FM policy processes mirrors the practices of other countries. For  
665 instance, in Nepal, the converging interests – political and others – predestined the policy as an ideal  
666 vehicle for meeting the fortunes and objectives of the maternal incentive scheme [53].

667 Our findings suggest that engaging and including the private sector in the design discussion  
668 was critical as they are key stakeholders in health service provision. Sitting at the centre of the policy  
669 triangle is the issue of power, and its role in decision-making is incontrovertible. The policy formulation  
670 process was characterised by 'mixed scanning and/or muddling through.' [15] The private sector plays  
671 a large and expanding role in healthcare service delivery, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, where the  
672 private-for-profit sector delivers 35% of outpatient care, and informal private providers deliver an  
673 additional 17% [54]. From our results, the private sector had used its power and leveraged its inclusion  
674 in implementing the policy based on its strengths of having previously developed systems such as an  
675 enhanced network of hospitals and community health volunteers and accreditation and quality  
676 monitoring standards and guidelines mirroring those of the implementing body NHIF. Researchers have

677 shown that such network strengths (such as the developed concept of social franchise networks) fostered  
678 the public-private relationship, thereby increasing private provider accreditation into the health systems  
679 and a collegial relationship that had given small private providers more voice in the health system and  
680 improved health outcomes [55, 56].

681 Some interests, particularly that of setting the price for the new entrants in the policy (the  
682 private sector), were rather contentious, and the engaged representatives of the private sector had to lay  
683 the reason for the request for the higher price of reimbursements. The NGOs representing the interests  
684 of the private sector in the informal settlements devised methods to bypass the political process at the  
685 formulation to engage the sector and shape the price debate at the grassroots level rather than at the top.  
686 Through their network of influence at the grassroots level, they were able to influence the  
687 reimbursement price and the implementation. They were what Sabatier and colleagues [57-59] label as  
688 policy advocates who dominated sub-policy coalitions of actors/stakeholders. Other similar  
689 organisations have used this strategy. For instance, in the evaluation of the Africa Health Market for  
690 Equity (AHME) program, which focuses on social franchising, it was noted that the performance of the  
691 providers of the social franchise led to improved performance of *Linda Mama* policy with 79% of the  
692 social franchising facilities participating in *Linda Mama* service provision [60]. However, their  
693 contributions depend on appropriate governance prerequisites, including institutions, management  
694 capacities, and a collaborative culture to allow effective partnerships and delivery designs that target  
695 those in need and underprivileged [61].

696 Our findings show that the policy redesign envisaged expanding coverage and enhancing  
697 administrative efficiency, aligning with other authors' findings [47]. The decision to make NHIF the  
698 ultimate purchaser of services was to improve the policy's long-term sustainability and ease logistical  
699 difficulties with reimbursements, given the NHIF's experience and reforms [62]. Further, it was to ease  
700 any legal hurdles in working with the NHIF [46]. On the other hand, while costing had been done using  
701 appropriate assumptions based on data, with the support of development partners in collaboration with  
702 Kenya's MoH and the NHIF, it may have needed to be more collaborative, especially since some key  
703 players in MoH felt excluded. It saw the development of a costed benefits package that would be  
704 acceptable to all players and allow adequate resource allocation because it estimated crucial elements

705 in the process. Given that the government subsidises the cost of providing health care services,  
706 especially in public health facilities (through paying for staff, medical supplies, and funding for  
707 operations and maintenance), the objective was not to reimburse the true cost of providing maternity  
708 services but to compensate for additional costs financed by women seeking care [63].

709 However, the private sector, NGOs and FBOs perceived their extensive investment  
710 (infrastructure, rent and staff) was high; thus, the proposed reimbursements were seen as unattractive.  
711 One study showed that government facilities have generally lower costs per service unit than Faith  
712 Based Organisations, other Nongovernmental Organisations and private-for-profit organisations (i.e.,  
713 without consideration of quality, Government facilities have a higher productivity than institutions of  
714 other trustees) and that the outpatient services the spread of costs is largest for private-for-profit  
715 facilities, signifying that either the productivity of privately run outpatient services is not homogeneous,  
716 or that quality varies widely within the sub-sector [64].

717 The finding provides imperative lessons that with the nature in which this policy design took  
718 place, and the many conflicts and strong time pressures that were involved, a collaborative approach,  
719 in this case, was done with a long and cumbersome search for an established common ground for  
720 harnessing the difference in the design and costing without eliminating it. Due to differing interests,  
721 there is a need for deliberations and dialogue while maintaining leadership and managing conflicts at  
722 the design stage. However, this collaborative approach was essential. It saw the preparation of the policy  
723 documents related to the redesign (Cabinet Memorandum requesting cabinet approval for increased  
724 allocation to the free maternity services program, implementation guidelines, and a technical policy  
725 proposal, a communication strategy to guide the introduction of the redesigned program) [62].

726 The stakeholders of the *Linda Mama* policy had an opportunity to form an interaction  
727 committee or platform where the formulation design and agenda were freely discussed and debated.  
728 Researchers have shown such collaborative approaches to policy design capacitate the affected and  
729 relevant players to devise novel solutions, creating a sense of joint commitment to and responsibility  
730 for implementing the policy design [14]. Further, it facilitates a collective exploration of policy  
731 problems that allows the stakeholders to agree on novel ways of defining the problem that both  
732 emphasise its urgency and make it solvable. Noteworthy is Dye's [65] assertion that public policies

733 often reflect the interests, preferences, and the values of the governing elites were evident in the  
734 committee. While the Presidency was not an active participant in the committee, the technocrats had to  
735 align the design to fit into his political promise and agenda of achieving the UHC. However, the  
736 participation of actors in the policy formulation was not as inclusive. Grindle and Thomas's [66]  
737 observation that despite the characteristics of policy actors such as personal attributes, loyalties,  
738 institutional and political commitments, and training, the actors are never completely autonomous. The  
739 stakeholders had to work within a meshed context and had to tackle the problems and issues (policy  
740 formulation) that they faced and provide a well-thought-through solution that was economically,  
741 politically, and administratively feasible.

742           The appointed government officials (often the technocrats in government), the development  
743 partners, and the representatives of the beneficiaries had a substantial influence on the formulation of  
744 the details of the policy. Whereas there were representatives of the beneficiaries, the results showed the  
745 beneficiaries interviewed did not know about any form of public participation. While it would be  
746 impractical to include all the participants in the formulation, the level of public participation in reforms  
747 highlights Grindle and Thomas's [66] assertion that the participation is a determined categorisation of  
748 the reform as a bureaucratic compliance reform, that requires limited or 'invisible' public participation  
749 or as requiring political stability and support which need 'visible' participation or a comprehensive  
750 public engagement. The finding shows that the beneficiaries' representatives were significant because  
751 they were classified in the FM reform as the latter. Only representatives voiced the participants'  
752 interests. In fact, in the formulation process of FM policy in Ghana, authors categorised the participants  
753 as policy agenda directors, agenda approvers, government and non-government agenda advisors, and  
754 agenda advocates [16]. The agenda advocates, including the beneficiaries, are active throughout the  
755 formulation process. Generally, there was good coordination of the policy processes at the formulation  
756 level; but, if the beneficiaries and the implementers are not well involved at the policy design stage, it  
757 would bring into focus the question of how committed they were to implement things that they had little  
758 say.

759           Significantly, more actors at the implementation level – both at the national and the county  
760 level – supported achieving the goals in audit, research, financing and strategic operations. These roles

761 by different actors affirm the findings in other research that actors look for the mobilisation of specific  
762 capacities to address particular policy problems, in this case, supporting policy implementation [67].  
763 Implementers of the *Linda Mama* policy understood their roles as was formulated; however, the  
764 communication at the national level was rather complex and messier since there was a gap in clearly  
765 defined roles in the communication network at the MoH. Every department wanted an ‘ear’ of the  
766 influential PS health in providing strategic decisions. Besides, the dependency of the policy imperatives  
767 at the top level was significantly higher as units had to rely on one another more often than necessary,  
768 slowing down the implementation cascade. These findings affirm that the *Linda Mama* policy has  
769 achieved three of the ten proposals Hogwood and Gunn [68] postulated for successful implementation.  
770 However, there is an interaction and better coordination of roles at the periphery (county and facility  
771 level) in that the county has gone further to employ someone to ease communication and coordination  
772 with different national and county departments. While there are gaps in the implementation  
773 perspectives, our work has captured the importance of implementation readiness of policy, which is  
774 done by ensuring that organisations and players responsible for implementation have accepted and  
775 support the legitimacy of the policy and that there is sustained political support which comes with  
776 enhanced policy clarity of the objectives and that players have all these set within their local contexts  
777 [69-71].

778 Overall, our findings are consistent with the exploration of the FM policy formulation literature  
779 elsewhere,[72] decision agendas of the *Linda Mama* policy were driven by a complex interplay of  
780 factors related to the context, processes and content, actors and their interests, power and roles, in an  
781 elaborate manner rather than linear processes; thus, reiterating the enduring relevance and validity of  
782 Walt and Gilson’s policy triangle [27]. This finding captures well Walt et al.’s [73] statement that ‘*there*  
783 *are also many other conceptual challenges...capturing and measuring the level of resources, values,*  
784 *beliefs and power of diverse actors is difficult.*’

785

## 786 **Conclusion**



787           The policy formulation process and the agenda-setting of the Kenyan free maternity policy  
788 presented drivers through policy content and ideas, context, actors and their powers, and issue framing  
789 within both bureaucratic and public venues to better understand the policy process. Our study highlights  
790 the basis for changing the previous policy to the current one driven by multiple agendas, including  
791 political determinants, the need to achieve global and national goals, and learnings from the previous  
792 policy. The interconnectedness of these drivers shaped the content and policy formulation processes.  
793 Additionally, it shows the influence of an actor's power on the policy process depends on the actor's  
794 interests, ideas and position to mobilise the agenda decisions to move in specific directions.  
795 Understanding policy processes is relevant across other LMICs, and we hope that this framework  
796 contributes to policy analysis and learning in Kenya and beyond.

797

798           **Acknowledgements:** The authors acknowledge all those who participated in the study and  
799 donated their time and skills.

800

## 801 Reference

- 802
- 803 1. Ombere OS, Nyambedha OE, Haller T, Merten S. Local perspectives on policy  
804 implementation of free maternity health services in Kenya: Implications for universal health  
805 coverage. 2023.
- 806 2. Orangi S, Kairu A, Malla L, Ondera J, Mbuthia B, Ravishankar N, et al. Impact of  
807 free maternity policies in Kenya: an interrupted time-series analysis. *BMJ Global Health*.  
808 2021;6(6):e003649. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003649.
- 809 3. Chuma J, Maina T. *Free Maternal Care and Removal of User Fees at Primary-Level*  
810 *Facilities in Kenya*. Washington, DC: Health Policy Project, Futures Group, 2013.
- 811 4. Bourbonnais N. *Implementing Free Maternal Health Care in Kenya: Challenges,*  
812 *Strategies and Recommendations* Nairobi: The Kenya National Commission on Human  
813 Rights; 2013 [cited 2020 7 December]. Available from:  
814 [https://repository.graduateinstitute.ch/record/286964/files/Bourbonnais\\_Maternal%20Health](https://repository.graduateinstitute.ch/record/286964/files/Bourbonnais_Maternal%20Health%20Care%20in%20Kenya.pdf)  
815 [%20Care%20in%20Kenya.pdf](https://repository.graduateinstitute.ch/record/286964/files/Bourbonnais_Maternal%20Health%20Care%20in%20Kenya.pdf).
- 816 5. Tama E, Molyneux S, Waweru E, Tsofa B, Chuma J, Barasa E. Examining the  
817 implementation of the free maternity services policy in Kenya: a mixed methods process  
818 evaluation. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*. 2018;7(7):603-13. Epub  
819 2018/07/13. doi: 10.15171/ijhpm.2017.135. PubMed PMID: 29996580; PubMed Central  
820 PMCID: PMC6037504.
- 821 6. Orangi S, Kairu A, Ondera J, Mbuthia B, Koduah A, Oyugi B, et al. Examining the  
822 implementation of the Linda Mama free maternity program in Kenya. *The International*  
823 *Journal of Health Planning and Management*. 2021.
- 824 7. Oyugi B. *The Policy Process, Quality and Cost of Free Maternal Healthcare in Kenya:*  
825 *A Mixed Methods Analysis of Maternity Policy*: University of Kent, Centre for Health  
826 Services Studies, University of Kent; 2021.
- 827 8. Gitobu C, Gichangi P, Mwanda W. Patterns in maternal mortality following the  
828 implementation of a free maternal health care policy in Kenyan public health facilities. *East*  
829 *African Medical Journal*. 2017;94(6):433-44.
- 830 9. Gitobu C, Gichangi P, Mwanda W. Causes of neonatal mortality two years before and  
831 after the implementation of a free maternal health care policy in Kenyan public health  
832 facilities. *East African Medical Journal*. 2017;94(5):323-35.
- 833 10. Lang'at E, Mwanri L, Temmerman M. Effects of implementing free maternity service  
834 policy in Kenya: an interrupted time series analysis. *BMC Health Service Research*.  
835 2019;19(1):645. Epub 2019/09/08. doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-4462-x. PubMed PMID:  
836 31492134; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6729061.
- 837 11. Gitobu C, Gichangi P, Mwanda W. The effect of Kenya's free maternal health care  
838 policy on the utilization of health facility delivery services and maternal and neonatal  
839 mortality in public health facilities. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*. 2018;18(1):77.
- 840 12. Gitobu CM, Gichangi PB, Mwanda WO. Satisfaction with delivery services offered  
841 under the free maternal healthcare policy in Kenyan public health facilities. *Journal of*  
842 *Environmental and Public Health*. 2018;2018:4902864. doi: 10.1155/2018/4902864.
- 843 13. Oyugi B, Kendall S, Peckham S, Orangi S, Barasa E. Exploring the Adaptations of  
844 the Free Maternity Policy Implementation by Health Workers and County Officials in Kenya.  
845 *Global Health: Science and Practice*. 2023;11(5).
- 846 14. Ansell C, Sørensen E, Torfing J. Improving policy implementation through  
847 collaborative policymaking. *Policy & Politics*. 2017;45(3):467-86.
- 848 15. Buse K, Mays N, Walt G. *Making Health Policy*. Berkshire: Open University Press;  
849 2012.

- 850 16. Koduah A, van Dijk H, Agyepong IA. The role of policy actors and contextual factors  
851 in policy agenda setting and formulation: maternal fee exemption policies in Ghana over four  
852 and a half decades. *Health Research Policy and Systems*. 2015;13:27. doi: 10.1186/s12961-  
853 015-0016-9. PubMed PMID: 26022699; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4450986.
- 854 17. Green-Pedersen C, Wilkerson J. How agenda-setting attributes shape politics: basic  
855 dilemmas, problem attention and health politics developments in Denmark and the US.  
856 *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2006;13(7):1039-52.
- 857 18. Hall P, Land H, Parker RA, Webb AL. Change, choice, and conflict in social policy.  
858 (No Title). 1975.
- 859 19. Shiffman J, Smith S. Generation of political priority for global health initiatives: a  
860 framework and case study of maternal mortality. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9595):1370-9.
- 861 20. World Health Organization. Trends in maternal mortality 2000 to 2020: estimates by  
862 WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank Group and UNDESA/Population Division Geneva:  
863 World Health Organization; 2023 [cited 2023 12 March]. Available from:  
864 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240068759>.
- 865 21. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, ICF. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey  
866 2022. Key Indicators Report Nairobi, Kenya, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: KNBS and  
867 ICF; 2023 [cited 2023 12 March]. Available from:  
868 [https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-PR143-Preliminary-Reports-Key-](https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-PR143-Preliminary-Reports-Key-Indicators-Reports.cfm)  
869 [Indicators-Reports.cfm](https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-PR143-Preliminary-Reports-Key-Indicators-Reports.cfm).
- 870 22. Keats EC, Ngugi A, Macharia W, Akseer N, Khaemba EN, Bhatti Z, et al. Progress  
871 and priorities for reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health in Kenya: a countdown to  
872 2015 country case study. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2017;5(8):e782-e95.
- 873 23. Oyugi B, Nizalova O, Kendall S, Peckham S. Does a free maternity policy in Kenya  
874 work? Impact and cost-benefit consideration based on demographic health survey data. *Eur J*  
875 *Health Econ*. 2023. Epub 2023/02/14. doi: 10.1007/s10198-023-01575-w. PubMed PMID:  
876 36781615.
- 877 24. Gilson L, Orgill M, Shroff ZC. *A Health Policy Analysis Reader: the Politics of*  
878 *Policy Change in Low-and Middle-Income Countries*. Geneva: World Health Organisation;  
879 2018.
- 880 25. Hercot D, Meessen B, Ridde V, Gilson L. Removing user fees for health services in  
881 low-income countries: a multi-country review framework for assessing the process of policy  
882 change. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2011;26(SUPPL. 2):ii5-ii15. doi:  
883 10.1093/heapol/czr063.
- 884 26. Patton CV, Sawicki DS. *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning*. 2nd ed.  
885 Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1993.
- 886 27. Walt G, Gilson L. Reforming the health sector in developing countries: the central  
887 role of policy analysis. *Health Policy and Planning*. 1994;9(4):353-70.
- 888 28. Brugha R, Varvasovszky Z. Stakeholder analysis: a review. *Health Policy and*  
889 *Planning*. 2000;15(3):239-46.
- 890 29. Crosby B. *Stakeholder Analysis: A Vital Tool for Strategic Managers*. Washington:  
891 USAID's Implementing Policy Change Project; 1992.
- 892 30. Varvasovszky Z, Brugha R. A stakeholder analysis. *Health Policy and Planning*.  
893 2000;15(3):338-45.
- 894 31. Gilson L, Erasmus E, Borghi J, Macha J, Kamuzora P, Mtei G. Using stakeholder  
895 analysis to support moves towards universal coverage: lessons from the SHIELD project.  
896 *Health Policy and Planning*. 2012;27(suppl\_1):i64-i76. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czs007.
- 897 32. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2019 Kenya Population and Housing Census  
898 Volume I: Population by County and Sub-County Nairobi: Kenya National Bureau of  
899 Statistics; 2019 [cited 2020 27 March]. Available from:

- 900 <https://www.knbs.or.ke/?wpdmpro=2019-kenya-population-and-housing-census-volume-i->  
901 [population-by-county-and-sub-county](https://www.knbs.or.ke/?wpdmpro=2019-kenya-population-and-housing-census-volume-i-population-by-county-and-sub-county).
- 902 33. County Government of Kiambu. About Kiambu County 2018 [cited 2020 27 March].  
903 Available from: <https://kiambu.go.ke/about-us/#2>.
- 904 34. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, Kenya Ministry of Health, National AIDS  
905 Control Council, Kenya Medical Research institute, National Council for Population and  
906 Development, ICF international. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014 Calverton,  
907 MD: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics & ICF international; 2014 [cited 2017 5th May].  
908 Available from: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/fr308/fr308.pdf>.
- 909 35. Terry G, Hayfield N, Clarke V, Braun V. Thematic analysis. In: Willig C, Stainton-  
910 Rogers, editors. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology. 2 ed. London:  
911 Sage; 2017. p. 17-37.
- 912 36. Clarke V, Braun V. Thematic analysis. The Journal of Positive Psychology.  
913 2017;12(3):297-8. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613.
- 914 37. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in  
915 Psychology. 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 916 38. Attride-Stirling J. Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research.  
917 Qualitative Research. 2001;1(3):385-405.
- 918 39. Urquhart C. An encounter with grounded theory: tackling the practical and  
919 philosophical issues. In: Trauth EM, editor. Qualitative Research in IS: Issues and Trends.  
920 Hershey, PA: Idea Group; 2001. p. 104-40.
- 921 40. Kenya Ministry of Health. Kenya Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and  
922 Adolescent Health (RMNCAH) Investment Framework. Nairobi, Kenya: Kenya Ministry of  
923 Health; 2016.
- 924 41. The Constitution of Kenya, (2010).
- 925 42. The Republic of Kenya. Kenya Vision 2030. In: The National Economic and Social  
926 Council of Kenya, editor. Nairobi, Keny: The National Economic and Social Council of  
927 Kenya,; 2007.
- 928 43. Kenyan Ministry of Health. Kenya Health Sector Strategic Plan Transforming Health  
929 Systems: Achieving Universal Health Coverage by 2022 - July 2018–June 2023 Nairobi:  
930 Kenyan Ministry of Health; 2018 [cited 2023 30 August]. Available from:  
931 [http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/Kenya\\_Health\\_Sector\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_July\\_2018-](http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/Kenya_Health_Sector_Strategic_Plan_July_2018-)  
932 [June\\_2023.pdf](http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/Kenya_Health_Sector_Strategic_Plan_July_2018-June_2023.pdf).
- 933 44. Kenyan Ministry of Devolution and Planning. Progress in achievement of Millenium  
934 Development Goals in Kenya: Final Status Report 2015 Nairobi, Kenya: Kenyan Ministry of  
935 Devolution and Planning; 2016 [cited 2023 30 August]. Available from:  
936 <https://www.planning.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Progress-in-Achievement-of->  
937 [MDGs-in-Kenya-2016.pdf](https://www.planning.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Progress-in-Achievement-of-MDGs-in-Kenya-2016.pdf).
- 938 45. The Jubilee Party of Kenya. Continuing Kenya’s Transformation, Together Nairobi:  
939 JubileePamoja.co.ke; 2017 [cited 2020 8 June]. Available from:  
940 <http://deputyresident.go.ke/images/jpmanifesto2017.pdf>.
- 941 46. KELIN Kenya. Hinging maternal health services on NHIF – a critic of the  
942 constitutional legality of the Linda Mama Programme Nairobi: KELIN Kenya; 2019 [cited  
943 2020 24 May]. Available from: [https://www.kelinkenya.org/hinging-maternal-health-](https://www.kelinkenya.org/hinging-maternal-health-services-on-nhif-a-critic-of-the-constitutional-legality-of-the-linda-mama-programme/#_ftn1)  
944 [services-on-nhif-a-critic-of-the-constitutional-legality-of-the-linda-mama-programme/#\\_ftn1](https://www.kelinkenya.org/hinging-maternal-health-services-on-nhif-a-critic-of-the-constitutional-legality-of-the-linda-mama-programme/#_ftn1).
- 945 47. Kenya Ministry of Health, National Hospital Insurance Fund. Implementation Manual  
946 for Programme Managers Nairobi: National Hospital Insurance Fund; 2016 [cited 2020 24th  
947 June]. Available from: [https://www.health.go.ke/wp-](https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/implementation-manual-softy-copy-sample.pdf)  
948 [content/uploads/2018/11/implementation-manual-softy-copy-sample.pdf](https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/implementation-manual-softy-copy-sample.pdf).

- 949 48. Exworthy M, Powell M. Big windows and little windows: implementation in the  
950 'congested state'. *Public Administration*. 2004;82(2):263-81.
- 951 49. The Health Act—The Health Financing Reforms Expert Panel for the Transformation  
952 and Repositioning of National Hospital Insurance Fund as a Strategic Purchaser of Health  
953 Services for the Attainment of Universal Health Coverage by 2022, THE HEALTH ACT  
954 (No. 21 of 2017) (2019).
- 955 50. Kingdon J, W. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2 ed. Harlow: Longman  
956 Publishing Group; 2010.
- 957 51. Gilson L, Doherty J, Lake S, McIntyre D, Mwikisa C, Thomas S. The SAZA study:  
958 implementing health financing reform in South Africa and Zambia. *Health Policy and  
959 Planning*. 2003;18(1):31-46.
- 960 52. Meessen B, Hercot D, Noirhomme M, Ridde V, Tibouti A, Tashobya CK, et al.  
961 Removing user fees in the health sector: a review of policy processes in six sub-Saharan  
962 African countries. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2011;26(SUPPL. 2):ii16-ii29. doi:  
963 10.1093/heapol/czr062.
- 964 53. Ensor T, Clapham S, Prasai DP. What drives health policy formulation: insights from  
965 the Nepal maternity incentive scheme? *Health Policy*. 2009;90(2-3):247-53.
- 966 54. Montagu D, Chakraborty N. *Private Sector Utilization: Insights from Standard Survey  
967 Data*. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2019.
- 968 55. Suchman L. Accrediting private providers with National Health Insurance to better  
969 serve low- income populations in Kenya and Ghana: a qualitative study. *International Journal  
970 for Equity in Health*. 2018;17(1):179.
- 971 56. Suchman L, Hart E, Montagu D. Public-private partnerships in practice: collaborating  
972 to improve health finance policy in Ghana and Kenya. *Health policy and planning*.  
973 2018;33(7):777-85.
- 974 57. Jenkins-Smith HC, Nohrstedt D, Weible CM, Sabatier PA. The advocacy coalition  
975 framework: Foundations, evolution, and ongoing research. *Theories of the policy process*.  
976 2014;3:183-224.
- 977 58. Sabatier PA. An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of  
978 policy-oriented learning therein. *Policy sciences*. 1988;21(2-3):129-68.
- 979 59. Sabatier PA, Weible CM. *Theories of the policy process*: Westview Press; 2014.
- 980 60. Appleford G. AHME Support to Kenya's Linda Mama Free Maternity Programme  
981 Through Social Franchising - What Did we Learn? : Marie Stopes International; 2019 [cited  
982 2020 7 December]. Available from: [http://www.hanshep.org/our-  
983 programmes/AHMEresources/14158\\_LindaMamaCaseStudy\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.hanshep.org/our-programmes/AHMEresources/14158_LindaMamaCaseStudy_FINAL.pdf).
- 984 61. Nabyonga-Orem J, Nabukalu JB, Okuonzi SA. Partnership with private for-profit  
985 sector for universal health coverage in sub-Saharan Africa: opportunities and caveats. *BMJ  
986 Global Health*. 2019;4(Suppl 9):e001193.
- 987 62. Health Policy Plus. HP+ costing work helping to expand Kenya's free maternal health  
988 program, reaching 700,000 women each year 1331 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Suite 600,  
989 Washington, DC 20004: Health Policy Plus; 2016 [cited 2023 18 November]. Available  
990 from: <http://www.healthpolicyplus.com/KenyaLindaMama.cfm>.
- 991 63. Kenya Ministry of Health. Policy Proposal on the Presidents' Initiative on Free  
992 Maternal Health Services in Kenya Nairobi, Kenya: The Health Policy Project; 2016 [cited  
993 2023 18 November]. Available from:  
994 <https://www.healthpolicyproject.com/ns/docs/kenyanewsfreematernalhealthattachment.pdf>.
- 995 64. Flessa S, Moeller M, Ensor T, Hornetz K. Basing care reforms on evidence: the  
996 Kenya health sector costing model. *BMC health services research*. 2011;11:1-15.
- 997 65. Dye TR. *Top Down Policymaking*. New York, NY: Chatham House Publishers of  
998 Seven Bridges Press, LLC; 2001.

- 999 66. Grindle MS, Thomas JW. Public choices and policy change: the political economy of  
1000 reform in developing countries. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; 1991.
- 1001 67. Saddi FdC, Peckham S, Bloom G, Turnbull N, Coelho VS, Denis J-L. Employing the  
1002 policy capacity framework for health system strengthening. Oxford University Press UK;  
1003 2023. p. 1-13.
- 1004 68. Hogwood BW, Gunn LA. Policy Analysis for the Real World. New York: Oxford  
1005 University Press; 1984.
- 1006 69. Peckham S, Hudson B, Hunter D, Redgate S. Policy success: What is the role of  
1007 implementation support programmes? *Social Policy & Administration*. 2022;56(3):378-93.
- 1008 70. Burn E, Redgate S, Needham C, Peckham S. Implementing England's Care Act 2014:  
1009 was the Act a success and when will we know? *International Journal of Care and Caring*.  
1010 2023:1-17.
- 1011 71. Hudson B, Hunter D, Peckham S. Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap:  
1012 can policy support programs help? *Policy design and practice*. 2019;2(1):1-14.
- 1013 72. Koduah A, Agyepong IA, van Dijk H. Towards an explanatory framework for  
1014 national level maternal health policy agenda item evolution in Ghana: an embedded case  
1015 study. *Health Research Policy and Systems*. 2018;16(1):76.
- 1016 73. Walt G, Shiffman J, Schneider H, Murray SF, Brugha R, Gilson L. 'Doing' health  
1017 policy analysis: methodological and conceptual reflections and challenges. *Health Policy and  
1018 Planning*. 2008;23(5):308-17.  
1019

**Services for all pregnant women and newborns, for a period of one year**

Antenatal care (ANC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-ANC Profile including Hemoglobin levels, Blood group, Rhesus, Serology, screening for tuberculosis, HIV counseling and testing and urinalysis</li> <li>-Preventive services including tetanus toxoid, intermittent preventive treatment for malaria, deworming, iron and folate supplementation</li> <li>-Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV (PMTCT)</li> </ul>
Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Skilled delivery (including caesarean section) in public facilities and accredited not-for-profit and for-profit private health institutions.</li> <li>-Neonatal care including costs related to pre-term births</li> </ul>
Postnatal care (PNC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Within 48 hours after birth: Analgesics, vitamin A, iron and folate supplements, long lasting insecticide nets, family planning, PMTCT for HIV positive mothers, treatment or refer any complications for mother, and care for newborn (tetracycline eye ointment, Vitamin K, immunization and birth polio, Infant prophylaxis for HIV if indicated, treat or refer any complications).</li> <li>-Within 1-2 weeks after birth (mother and baby): Screening for cervical cancer, sexually transmitted infections and tuberculosis; and treatment/preventive measures if not previously administered</li> <li>-Within 4-6 weeks after birth: Family planning services, screening for cervical cancer, STIs and tuberculosis among others; and immunization as per schedule and early infant diagnosis of HIV</li> <li>-Within 4-6 months after birth: Family planning services, screening for cervical cancer, STI and tuberculosis among others; and immunization as per schedule and vitamin A supplementation</li> </ul>
Emergency referrals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ambulance service</li> </ul>
Conditions and complications during pregnancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Outpatient treatment in accredited public, faith-based and selected low-cost private-for-profit facilities</li> <li>-Inpatient treatment in accredited public, faith-based and selected low cost private-for-profit facilities</li> </ul>
<b>Children under 1 year</b>	
Care for the infant*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Outpatient services including treatment and child welfare clinics in accredited public, faith-based and selected low-cost private-for-profit facilities</li> <li>-Inpatient services in accredited public, faith-based and selected low cost private-for-profit facilities</li> </ul>

\*Care for the infant is within the one year period in the programme.

Figure 1

FACILITY TYPE	SERVICES	FACILITY LEVEL		
		Level II and III	Level IV and V	Level VI
Government healthcare facilities	<i>Normal delivery</i>	KES 2,500	KES 5,000	KES 6,000
	<i>Caesarean section</i>	N/A	KES 5,000	KES 17,000
	<i>Antenatal care</i>	KES 600 for 1st visit then KES 300 for each of the 3 subsequent visits	KES 1,000 for 1st visit then KES 300 for each of the 3 subsequent visits	KES 1,000 for 1st visit then KES 500 for each of the 3 subsequent visits
	<i>Post Natal care</i>	KES 250 per visit	KES 250 per visit	KES 250 per visit
	<i>Ambulatory services</i>	Transport for emergency referrals available at a fixed rate based on the number of services		
Private and faith-based facilities	<i>Normal delivery</i>	KES 3,500	KES 6,000	KES 6,000
	<i>Caesarean section</i>	N/A	KES 17,000	KES 17,000
	<i>Antenatal care</i>	KES 1,000 for 1st visit then KES 500 for each of the 3 subsequent visits	KES 1,000 for 1st visit then KES 500 for each of the 3 subsequent visits	KES 1,000 for 1st visit then KES 500 for each of the 3 subsequent visits
	<i>Post Natal care</i>	KES 250 per visit	KES 250 per visit	KES 250 per visit
	<i>Ambulatory services</i>	Transport for emergency referrals available at a fixed rate based on the number of services		
KEY:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #d9e1f2; padding: 5px; margin: 2px;">OUTPATIENT CARE</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #fce4d6; padding: 5px; margin: 2px;">INPATIENT CARE</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e2efda; padding: 5px; margin: 2px;">AMBULANCE SERVICES</div> </div>			
NOTES:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. N/A – Not Applicable</li> <li>2. Exchange rate <b>1 USD = KES 104.32</b>; as of <b>Jan 1, 2017</b> (<a href="https://www1.oanda.com/currency/converter/">https://www1.oanda.com/currency/converter/</a>)</li> <li>3. <b>Outpatient care:</b> Facilities are reimbursed based on the number of beneficiaries they provide care. The amounts are risk adjusted</li> <li>4. <b>Deliveries (either CS /normal):</b> Facilities are reimbursed as a delivery package where delivery is treated as an event.</li> <li>5. <b>Inpatient care:</b> Facilities are reimbursed for additional inpatient services other than deliveries as a rebate (based on the number of days the patients have taken in the hospital)</li> </ol>			

Figure 2






Figure 3