

# 1 **Leveraging Health Information System Maturity Assessments to Guide Strategic** 2 **Priorities: Perspectives from African Leaders**

## 3 **Authors**

4 Phiona Vumbugwa<sup>1,2</sup>, Nancy Puttkammer<sup>1,2</sup>, Moira Majaha<sup>1</sup>, Sonora Stampfly<sup>2</sup>, Paul Biondich<sup>3</sup>,  
5 Jennifer Ellen Shivers<sup>3</sup>, Kendi Mburu<sup>4</sup>, Olusegun O. Soge<sup>1,5,6</sup>, Chris Longenecker<sup>1,7</sup>, Jan Flowers<sup>2</sup>,  
6 Caryl Feldacker<sup>1,2</sup>

7

## 8 **Affiliation**

9 1 Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

10 2 International Training and Education Centre for Health, Department of Global Health, University  
11 of Washington, Seattle, Washington

12 3 Regenstrief Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana

13 4 PATH, Washington DC, USA

14 5 School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

15 6 Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle,  
16 Washington

17 7 Division of Cardiology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

18

## 19 **Abstract**

### 20 **Introduction**

21 Central to a functional public health system is a strong health information ecosystem and robust  
22 data use. Many low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) face the task of digitizing their health  
23 information systems (HIS). For health leaders, deciding what to prioritize when investing in HIS  
24 strengthening is central to this daunting challenge.

### 25 **Objectives**

26 The study explores how HIS maturity assessment contributes to HIS strengthening, describes the  
27 facilitators and barriers to HIS maturity assessments, and how health leaders can prioritize  
28 conducting maturity assessments.

### 29 **Methods**

30 This descriptive qualitative study employed key informant interviews (KIIs) with fourteen eHealth  
31 leaders at national and international levels working or supporting Ministries of Health's national  
32 HIS in LMICs. Results were analyzed using Dedoose Version 9.0 to develop themes based  
33 on the health systems' building blocks as a framework for identifying facilitators and  
34 barriers to conducting HIS maturity assessment.

### 35 **Results**

36 Participants identified maturity assessments as a critical beginning step to HIS strengthening,  
37 showing the system's performance, and building a baseline response to systematic data quality  
38 challenges. Barriers to conducting HIS maturity assessment include lacking collaborators' buy-in,

39 fragmented vision, low financial/human resources, and overdependence on donor priorities. Non-  
40 supportive policies, a lack of execution champions, and an inadequately skilled workforce in  
41 conducting maturity assessments or negotiating for their prioritization hinder maturity assessment  
42 implementation. Frequently identified facilitators to promoting HIS maturity assessment include  
43 multi-stakeholder engagement, understanding the country’s HIS ecosystem, and priorities to  
44 appropriately integrate maturity assessment objectives. Recommendations include capacity  
45 building in data use and conducting maturity assessments at all health system levels to grow the  
46 demand and value of HIS maturity assessments.

## 47 **Conclusion**

48 Promoting HIS maturity assessments can help leaders prioritize areas to improve in the HIS  
49 ecosystem, making appropriate decisions that steward HIS maturity advancement. Addressing  
50 challenges that hinder HIS assessment implementation holds promise to identify a pathway to a  
51 strengthened health system.

52

53 *Keywords:* Health information systems (HIS), maturity assessments, health systems strengthening  
54 (HSS), informatics-savvy health organization (ISHO), digital health planning, eHealth.

55

## 56 **Author Summary**

57 Our manuscript specifically spotlights the perspectives of African eHealth leaders, centering  
58 voices on the barriers and facilitators to planning and implementing HIS maturity assessments. We  
59 demonstrate their perspective on how conducting maturity assessments can inform understanding  
60 of gaps to address in the HIS and strategic direction. We detail the leaders’ recommendations for  
61 using HIS maturity assessments in strengthening HIS governance and overall health systems for  
62 better population health outcomes in LMIC settings.

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

## 72 INTRODUCTION

73 Public health information systems are critical for health systems strengthening (HSS). Global  
74 health organizations endeavor to create digitized and integrated health information systems (HIS)  
75 with the capacity to collect, collate, and analyze vast amounts of information for rapid response to  
76 public health needs (1–3). The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the gaps in HIS’ ability to share  
77 information for decision-making (4). The lack of interoperable information systems and the limited  
78 implementation of automatic data exchange threaten health systems' functioning and performance.

79 Digital HIS provides fast, reliable, and efficient ways for governments to track public health  
80 interventions. Several low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) developed national digital  
81 health strategies utilizing the WHO-International Telecommunications Union (ITU) National  
82 eHealth Strategy Toolkit, with strategic objectives for developing a more informatics-savvy health  
83 organization (ISHO) (5–7). An informatics-savvy health organization obtains, effectively uses,  
84 and securely exchanges information to improve public health practice and population health  
85 outcomes (8,9).

86 Strengthening HIS and achieving ISHO goals requires understanding strengths, gaps, and maturity  
87 supported by an appropriate framework to effectively track and assess the core functions and  
88 capabilities of an HIS (10,11). HIS maturity assessments are often conducted as part of a  
89 governance function to learn and provide evidence for decision-making. We define maturity as the  
90 degree to which a digitized HIS is interoperable, scalable, offers security and privacy, complies  
91 with healthcare standard regulations, and makes health information readily available (4,8).  
92 Assessing the digital health systems’ maturity level is important to know what has been tried and/or  
93 done to scale or what still needs to be achieved as part of the strategic objectives. Public health  
94 leaders need proven tools to assess the maturity of their HIS.

95 Despite these assessments playing an essential role in HIS strengthening, the facilitators and  
96 barriers to conducting maturity assessments are unknown. Conducting maturity assessment  
97 supports the implementation of the WHO-ITU National eHealth Strategy toolkit, which shows  
98 promises to make HIS improvement plans (12). Few countries (Kenya, Ethiopia, Ghana, and  
99 Zambia) have conducted maturity assessments; these have not been conducted consistently and  
100 with no follow-up to verify that recommendations were implemented (13–15). Understanding how  
101 to plan and implement HIS maturity assessments is a critical step to holistic HSS.

102 The health system's functioning is aligned with the six building blocks: governance and leadership,  
103 health information, health workforce, financing, medicines and technologies, and service delivery  
104 (16). A well-functioning HIS provides information needed for governance and management of  
105 health systems, services provision, planning, decision-making, monitoring and evaluation (M&E),  
106 and quality improvement of health services (17). We explore (I) health leaders’ perceptions of the  
107 value and importance of maturity assessments as part of HIS governance and strategic planning,  
108 (II) barriers and facilitators to planning a maturity assessment, and (III) health leaders’  
109 recommendations for overcoming barriers to HIS maturity assessments.

110

## 111 **Methods**

### 112 *Design*

113 The project used a descriptive qualitative design to assess health leaders' perceptions of barriers,  
114 facilitators, and recommendations for conducting maturity assessments. Key informant interviews  
115 were conducted using a structured key informant guide.

#### 116 *Project setting*

117 The project was conducted with health directors from LMICs participating or supporting a global  
118 health informatics leaders' network. In 2023, I-TECH Digital Initiatives Group (DIGI), in  
119 partnership with Regenstrief Institute, launched the eHealth Leaders Forum community of practice  
120 (eHLF CoP) for national health information leaders in MoH. The eHLF provides peer learning,  
121 networking, and a place to share best practices. Health leaders discuss HIS implementation share  
122 challenges faced/opportunities for resources or research, offers peer support in digital/health  
123 information systems assessments, planning, and improvement. Through the forum, health leaders  
124 expressed the need for support in analyzing and selecting interventions that strengthen HIS.

125 eHLF is one of several initiatives for HIS capacity building supported through the US Centers for  
126 Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Technical Assistance Platform (TAP). Formation and  
127 secretariat services for eHLF were supported through TAP. eHLF is part of the overall TAP  
128 capacity development strategies that included digital health training for senior and mid-level  
129 leaders and the use of informatics-savvy health organization (ISHO) maturity assessments at  
130 national and sub-national levels. All MOH respondents participated in eHLF, and some but not all  
131 the respondents were exposed to other TAP capacity development interventions.

132

#### 133 *Participant selection, recruitment, and eligibility*

134 Health leaders were selected using a convenience sample from 10 countries. Participants either  
135 had a leadership position in the MoH at the director level (n=10) or represented partner  
136 organizations funding or supporting digital health innovations in the countries (n=4). The leaders  
137 participated in or supported the eHLF.

138 All participants had at least two years of experience in their roles and thus were expected to be  
139 conversant with the health informatics systems or digital health ecosystem. Participants with less  
140 than a year of experience in their role and those who did not respond to a second follow-up email  
141 were excluded.

142 An introductory message was developed, and initial contact with countries' MoH HIS leaders was  
143 made through email. where leaders provided their contact numbers to be added to the WhatsApp  
144 group platform. After six months of engagement and participation on the forum, at least one health  
145 leader per organization and country was purposively selected to participate in a thirty-minute  
146 virtual (ZOOM) interview scheduled at the participant's preferred time.

#### 147 *Data collection method*

148 All participants received an initial message seeking consent to participate in the study. After  
149 consenting, participants received the KI guide before the interview. A discussion format was used  
150 to solicit responses, with participants providing supporting documents where applicable. The  
151 interviews were recorded, where 30 minutes exceeded, permission to proceed was sought.  
152 Participants answered questions based on their knowledge and shared strategic documents  
153 published or grey literature supporting their responses.

154 *Data analysis*

155 The interview transcripts were analyzed using Dedoose Version 9.0. Initially, we developed a code  
156 book and coding linked to the interview questions. Inductive and deductive themes emerged as we  
157 analyzed the codes for each transcript. Inter-coder reliability was performed with primary and  
158 secondary coders by defining the codes, testing coding together, independent coding, and  
159 discussion after coding. Reliability was tested using Cohen's kappa formula and coders' agreement  
160 0.81 of the coding decision. Qualitative thematic analysis was conducted to identify themes  
161 relevant to each specific pillar, while content analysis was used to summarize information provided  
162 and evidence of best practices to support narratives (18,19). Themes for HIS maturity assessments  
163 contribution were matched with best practices drawn from supporting documents.  
164 Recommendations on prioritizing and conducting HIS maturity assessment were assigned priority  
165 levels from highest to lowest based on the frequency with which the theme was mentioned across  
166 respondents.

167 *Positionality statement*

168 The lead analyst (PV) is a healthcare practitioner from an LMIC, and their professional  
169 experiences, knowledge, and use of health information systems shaped this research. The research  
170 was conducted ethically, respecting the perspectives of all participants, contributing to a more  
171 inclusive and equitable workspace for individuals of all gender identities. Participants were  
172 engaged in a sensitive and open manner.

173 *Ethics considerations*

174 The ethics committee of the University of Washington (UW) internal review board (IRB) reviewed  
175 and approved the research under the UW IRB STUDY00018156. A formal verbal consent was  
176 obtained from all participants prior to conducting an interview. Participants provided consent to  
177 record the discussion, which was manually transcribed.

178 **RESULTS**

179 A total of 14 interviews were conducted; 12 were males, while 2 were females (Table 1). All  
 180 participants occupied the deputy director level or above in their respective organizations. In the  
 181 following sections, we report findings under the three objectives. Two categories are used for  
 182 quotes: 1: MoH who are MoH at the director level (n=10) and 2: PO who are partner organizations  
 183 funding or supporting MoH (n=4).

184 Table 1: Participant profile

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>National level</i>	<i>International level</i>
<i>Ministry of Health</i>	7	7	0
<i>Universities</i>	2	2	0
<i>Implementing partners</i>	1	1	0
<i>Funding Partner</i>	2	0	2
<i>Global organization</i>	2	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

185

186

187 *Objective 1: HIS maturity assessment contribution to strengthening HIS*

188 Maturity assessments were identified as a critical beginning step to strengthening HIS. However,  
 189 all participants agreed that there is a huge gap in conducting HIS maturity assessments in their  
 190 countries as a national approach, with only 3 out of 10 countries attesting to having conducted an  
 191 HIS maturity assessment in the past 3 to 5 years. Similarly, one participant stated that strategic  
 192 planning for HIS maturity assessments has not been done nor prioritized at the continent level.  
 193 Some participants confirmed being involved in implementing HIS maturity assessments as a once-  
 194 off, research-based, or nationwide activity. Respondents cited that most of these initiatives were  
 195 donor-driven; hence, they lacked follow-up to recommendations, ownership of results, and did not  
 196 prioritize countries' specific needs.

197 Participants indicated that a maturity assessment contributes to knowing the system's performance  
 198 and understanding the gaps and strengths to build a baseline on which to strengthen HIS. Other  
 199 participants acknowledged that maturity assessments provide a platform to respond to systematic  
 200 challenges and recommendations on data quality seen through DQAs and M&Es, which most  
 201 organizations support. Table 2 summarizes the contribution of HIS maturity assessments to  
 202 strengthening HIS and provides examples of corresponding best practices from evidence cited by  
 203 participants.

204 Table 2: Summary of HIS maturity assessments contribution to HIS strengthening

<i>Summary Point</i>	<i>Quote</i>	<i>Best Practice cited by KIIs</i>
I. Identifies focus areas that need to be addressed in an HIS, its strengths, and prioritize action	"...after the previous assessment, we then realized there are a number of issues that we needed to add looking at infrastructure, governance, the establishment of a health informatics and data analytics department, which is one critical area and addresses some issues pertaining to governance." MoH	Zambia conducted the ISHO maturity assessments to strengthen the performance of the SmartCare HIS system.
II. Provides data for evidence-based decisions, including policies and guidelines that prioritize	"after we did the assessment, where we found the most weaknesses is where we focused. But I'm not necessarily saying that the other areas were not focused on. Still, we were able to focus on that area	Kenya developed an online human resource capacitation platform, a training on digital health

	<i>interventions to strengthen the HIS</i>	<i>and have a number of initiatives listed in this area of workforce get to the level that we would want to be as a country,” MoH.</i>	systems as part of yearly accreditation.
III.	<i>Provides better advocacy opportunities for political will and prioritization of resource allocation towards interventions to strengthen HIS</i>	<i>“...we have that's what we call ANICiiS, which is the entity, but before that had to do all kinds of assessment in the health sector to see what are the gaps, what needs to be done, which resulted in what we call the digital plan for the country.” MoH</i>	The Democratic Republic of Congo's national digital health system budget is 80% funded by the government's post-HIS maturity assessments.
IV.	<i>Tracks longitudinal evolution and progress of HIS system performance and in providing accurate data</i>	<i>“If you don't know the existing systems' capacity and maturity, how can you make decisions and allocate resources to support this? So, the maturity assessment is critical in providing leaders with the information they need to plan and support efficient and optimal HIS strengthening.” MoH</i>	Ethiopia conducted an ISHO assessment in 2020 and followed up with another assessment in 2023 to track the progress of its HIS roadmap.
V.	<i>HIS maturity assessments provide an opportunity to work on systematic challenges seen in DQAs and M&amp;E, which most program budget allocations prioritize</i>	<i>“Currently, we are planning another level of assessment because there's some level of inconsistency with HIV data in Nigeria. So, we didn't want to determine the exact number of people who are currently on treatment because our spectrum data was showing that Nigeria has just reached maturity level on treatment, yet we are still having new patients on treatment” MoH.</i>	Nigeria is planning an ISHO assessment to validate the performance of the HIS systems.

205  
206

## 207 *Objective 2: Facilitators and barriers to HIS maturity assessments*

### 208 *Governance and Leadership*

209 Government support and political will were identified as the main facilitators to promote HIS  
210 maturity assessment. Policies and best practices backed by the MoH's HIS priorities were noted  
211 as effective motivators for HIS maturity assessment implementation. Policies reportedly empower  
212 health leaders by creating an enabling environment and allowing resource allocation to build a  
213 strong base for assessing HIS.

214 *“At the national level, a policy could create a national health information exchange*  
215 *between agencies, public and private, and would help to improve the coordination of*  
216 *tracking implementation through HIS maturity assessment.” PO*

217 Participants cited the lack of collaborators' buy-in and lack of shared vision as barriers to HIS  
218 maturity assessments. Without partner support, strategic plans are not enough to encourage  
219 engagement in HIS assessments. One respondent stated that,

220 *“Once we have that five-year strategic plan, we pick out key flagship activities, and we got*  
221 *this digitalization and the strengthening of the health information systems assessments.*  
222 *Once we do that, we engage with the member states ministries to get their buy-in, but you*  
223 *will not probably get 100% of the support, which is like one weakness or challenge because*  
224 *we don't impose ourselves.” MoH*

225 Another respondent echoed the lack of support from the government and policymakers and its  
226 impact on HIS assessments and strengthening.

227            *“In some countries, there is a lack of shared vision to invest in HIS. This can make it*  
228            *difficult to get the resources needed to plan maturity assessment and sustain HIS*  
229            *strengthening.” MoH*

### 230 *Health Financing*

231            The availability of dedicated funding for HIS was seen as a conduit to facilitate HIS maturity  
232            assessments. Participants acknowledged the advocacy surrounding the importance of HIS and its  
233            benefits, with some governments beginning to fund HIS interventions and infrastructure. Three  
234            participants from national and international levels gave an example of best practice in the  
235            Democratic Republic of Congo, where the government finances 80% of digital health information  
236            systems, with 1.5% of the national health budget invested towards strengthening digital health  
237            systems.

238            All participants firmly acknowledged donor support, including the development of district health  
239            initiatives and electronic health records (EHR) systems, as important to start conversations around  
240            maturity assessment and assessing scalability. One participant stated,

241            *“The openness by the government to receive financing from donors for the assessments,*  
242            *that's an opportunity...” MoH*

243            All participants acknowledged that financing for HIS remains the most significant challenge  
244            impacting efforts to prioritize planning of HIS assessments and overall system strengthening. It  
245            was commonly reported that a specific national HIS allocated budget was lacking. One key  
246            informant stated,

247            *“Looking at advocacy around M&E has been shown partly by having these critical*  
248            *positions in place, but is not complimented by a budget to say if we have at least 8-10% of*  
249            *the Ministry budget committed to M&E and informatics, then we know that the oil of the*  
250            *system is guaranteed. So, we find that advocacy is not there in terms of its translation into*  
251            *tangible activities due to poor funding. So, I would advocate that 8-10% of the Ministry*  
252            *budget always support the HIS’s M&E, including assessments, health informatics, and*  
253            *systems strengthening.” PO*

254            Most participants agreed that over-reliance on donors and funders prevents flexibility in planning  
255            for HIS assessments, which are generally not planned as part of the restricted funding. The same  
256            is seen to have placed over-dependency on donor priorities with less prioritization or room to  
257            negotiate for financing other critical competing priorities like maturity assessments. In support, a  
258            few participants indicated that their country’s budget to roll out the District Health Information  
259            System (DHIS2) is funded by the Global Fund and PEPFAR. One respondent stated,

260            *“In terms of specific budget to support, like DHIS2 hardware and infrastructure, that has*  
261            *been donor funded. Much of the support for DHIS2, if not mistaken, about 80% comes from*  
262            *the Global Fund, 20% is from PEPFAR, and 0% is from the government. Right now, we*  
263            *are rolling out EHR, electronic medical record; much of the support is coming from*  
264            *PEPFAR followed by Global Fund, and assessing their maturity is not part of the grant”*  
265            *KII 11 (MoH)*



266 Several participants indicated that having outside funders as the leading financial supporters  
267 severely impacts the ability of a country to prioritize and promote interventions that support HIS  
268 maturity assessments, as donors dictate the priority of the funding. One participant agreed, saying,

269 *“...what is not going well is that the financing structure has been too donor oriented, so*  
270 *the priorities have been donor orientated” MoH.*

### 271 *Workforce*

272 Participants noted the lack of training and skillset in maturity assessments for health workers who  
273 are essential health data collectors and users as a barrier to collecting valuable and credible data  
274 for prioritizing HIS assessment planning. One participant supported saying,

275 *“...skills and training of health workers in maturity assessment are limited, and that is a*  
276 *barrier, as it means that they may not be able to provide the most up-to-date information*  
277 *to show the performance of the system; there is a delay in getting this data to make*  
278 *decisions, delaying planning on appropriate HIS interventions” MoH.*

279 Skilled informatics and maturity assessment workforce were cited as vital in successfully  
280 implementing HIS assessments, yet countries lack personnel who can lead or conduct HIS  
281 assessments. Most health directors cited a lack of recognition for health informatics roles within  
282 the health workforce and a lack of power to negotiate priorities to focus on HIS being a barrier to  
283 HIS assessments. The lack of motivation and poor working conditions, including long hours, low  
284 pay, and inadequate resources, contributed to governments’ inability to retain key informatics  
285 skilled staff.

286 It was commonly noted that countries lack specific training structures for health informatics or  
287 HIS personnel as digitization of HIS has only recently become part of the health system structure.  
288 Two participants from national universities echoed that training has often been ad-hoc, and  
289 developing standardized training programs is challenging. Respondents believed that improving  
290 these conditions could motivate leaders to invest in the HIS workforce, which is key in HIS  
291 assessments and overall healthcare improvement.

292 Most participants, 11 of 14, echoed that the current workforce structure facilitates the capacity of  
293 available health workers with knowledge of the importance of conducting HIS maturity  
294 assessments. Participants cited methods such as including HIS mentorship or training in license  
295 renewal platforms, departmental mentorships to review reports, data use, and structuring tailored  
296 training on HIS for specific needs. All the above were seen as facilitators to appropriately integrate  
297 maturity assessment objectives as the workforce understands the country’s HIS ecosystem and  
298 priorities better, thus making planning easy. Across the board, all respondents noted that the  
299 workforce's skillset is essential in ensuring a well-functioning HIS with the ability to plan and  
300 conduct assessments effectively, implementing any required changes noted.

301

### 302 *Infrastructure and Medical Supplies*

303 Most participants believed the diversity of systems, the heterogeneity in investments in ICT  
304 infrastructure, and HIS supplies to be significant barriers for many LMICs to plan for HIS maturity  
305 assessments due to cost and availability. Also, the expensive technology has led to having several  
306 fragmented HIS systems, either disease-specific or program-specific and non-interoperable; as

307 such, integrating HIS maturity assessment plans becomes a challenge. Many cited this as why HIS  
 308 is not prioritized over other health system pillars. The HIS infrastructure should be defined to plan  
 309 for a maturity assessment, as explained by one participant,

310 *“I think the infrastructure is a real challenge because we need to ensure that we have*  
 311 *connectivity, which is one of the challenges, apart from the equipment like servers,*  
 312 *firewalls, and switches that are too expensive to buy and maintain, thus makes HIS*  
 313 *assessment less priority, we only replace the piece not functional” MoH.*

314 A few participants brought up an important point that for the few countries that have made steady  
 315 progress in planning and implementing HIS assessments, the biggest challenge has been having  
 316 standard/user-friendly tools, standardizing and having interoperable systems as countries use  
 317 different electronic medical records (EMR) systems, such as open source medical records system  
 318 (OpenMRS), laboratory and management information systems (LAMIS), and others. Many  
 319 participants stated that each implementing partner would have its own unique system, which has  
 320 resulted in a very disintegrated HIS landscape, making it challenging to prioritize HIS maturity  
 321 assessment planning as systems need to be separated because their maturity and implementation  
 322 may not be comparable.

323 *“So, there are multiple systems that are in use and coming, and they are not interoperable.*  
 324 *As a result, there is duplication and redundancy in that aspect; we find it hard to pick*  
 325 *which one to strengthen.” PO*

326  
 327 Uniquely, one participant pointed out that infrastructure for health information systems falls  
 328 under different departments and is regulated by ministries, like the Ministry of ICT or Finance,  
 329 making it challenging for the MoH to prioritize HIS funding and planning HIS maturity  
 330 assessments as the infrastructure belongs to a different ministry. Stating something almost  
 331 similar, several respondents cited technology evolving quickly and infrastructure becoming  
 332 outdated or incompatible faster than strengthening processes can catch up, posing a challenge for  
 333 keeping HIS assessment planning and implementation up to speed.

334  
 335 Table 3. Summary of barriers and facilitators to planning HIS maturity assessments

<b>HSS Pillar</b>	<b>Barriers</b>	<b>Facilitators</b>	<b>Example of HIS strategic documents</b>
<i>Leadership and governance</i>	Lack of collaborators’ buy-in, shared vision, and supporting policies	Coordinated implementation of HIS policies through a national HIS ministry	Ministry of Public Health, DRC. National Development Plan Health Informatics 2020-2024 (20)
<i>Financing</i>	There is no specific national HIS budget to support HIS maturity assessments.	Allocate a specific national digital/HIS strengthening budget	Democratic Republic of The Congo Ministry of Public Health Quantified Roadmap of Digital Health Investments (21)
<i>Information systems</i>	Fragmented systems that rely on power and connectivity	Open Source Systems that are interoperable and standardized building from external collaborations	Ministry of Public Health, DRC. National Development Plan Health Informatics 2020-2024 (20)
<i>Workforce</i>	Inadequate technically capacitated staff to properly understand, use, maintain, and manage HIS infrastructure and technology	Curriculum for HIS workforce and health workers orientation	Kenya’s Virtual Academy online training for health workers (22) Zimbabwe and Ethiopia informatics training within the University of Zimbabwe and the University of Gondar
<i>Service delivery</i>	Competing priorities	Collaborating with other organizations and agencies,	DRC’s One Health HIS system

	Siloed and fragmented HIS systems divorced from the national HIS structure make choosing or integrating systems to focus maturity assessment difficult.	leveraging partnerships to provide resources, expertise, and support for HIS strengthening efforts.	Zambia’s SmartCare System
<i>Medical supplies</i>	lack of standard/user-friendly tools Costly equipment and infrastructure, including maintaining server rooms, providing reliable connectivity at all levels	Flexible resource allocation systems	Integration of mobile technology to supplement HIS

336

337

338 *Objective 3: Ways health leaders can better plan for HIS maturity assessments*

339

340 Participants provided various ways health leaders can better plan HIS maturity assessments in their  
341 countries.

342

343 All participants recommended multi-stakeholder collaborative engagement when planning  
344 maturity assessments, from the idea's conception to completion. Several participants attested that  
345 engagement is crucial to ensure that all parties understand and agree on the objectives and  
346 methodology of the assessment, leverage existing M&E systems, and piggyback on already  
347 established systems, such as the DHIS2 monitoring, to effectively plan for an HIS maturity  
348 assessment. One participant emphasized that for HIS maturity assessment planning to be effective,  
349 there needs to be strong collaborative engagement of all stakeholders to advocate for government  
350 prioritization and political will to support the initiative.

351

352 Several participants stated that collaborators should be involved in planning a maturity assessment  
353 based on their context. Another participant stated that stakeholders hold different powers and  
354 expertise, which is key when planning a maturity assessment for the country. Participants outlined  
355 the need to bring a sense of recognition, ownership, and support to plan a participatory action-  
356 based maturity assessment. More than half of the participants supported planning for action by  
357 prioritizing using context-based assessment tools, minimizing duplication of activities, and letting  
358 countries decide the processes. In support, one participant echoed that.

359

360 *“Stakeholders should not be restricted only to MoH’s HIS and digital health department*  
361 *but include all partners, implementing, funding, Ministry of Information and the regulatory*  
362 *bodies, telecommunications (public and private), power supply organizations, community*  
363 *representatives and advocates. The inclusion of such key stakeholders capacitates them to*  
364 *understand the need for prioritizing HIS assessments and their role in setting goals and*  
365 *ownership of recommendations.” MoH*

366

367 Almost all (11/14) participants highly prioritized increasing the use of data when planning for HIS  
368 maturity assessment. Respondents indicated that the available systems’ data should be used to  
369 show the system's weaknesses or strengths for the leaders to focus the assessment. A few also cited  
370 that stakeholders should have access and the ability to analyze or report the data, and that would

371 prepare them to understand assessment findings and take ownership to improve the system. Table  
 372 2 summarizes recurring recommendations from participants.

373

374

375 Table 4: Summary of recommendations of ways health leaders can better plan for HIS maturity  
 376 assessments

<b>Recommendations when planning a maturity assessment</b>	<b>Key quote</b>	<b>Priority</b>
<i>Collaborative engagement through stakeholder mapping</i>	<i>“A multi-stakeholder, a multi-organization, multidisciplinary approach to the assessment, so ensuring that there’s a lot of good participation from a key set of diverse stakeholders...” PO</i>	High
<i>Identify the country’s priorities and choose appropriate implementation tools, implementers, time, and process.</i>	<i>“And finally, relevance to the local context, so, for the assessment to work well, it should be relevant to that local context so that findings apply to those specific needs of each country or organization. The data collection tool itself should be flexible to meet those needs....” MoH</i>	High
<i>Increase utilization of available health data to grow the demand and value of an HIS and have its assessment prioritized.</i>	<i>“I think we need to be very specific in the way that we solve the problems by using tools, for instance, these same digital health maturity tools, break them down even to the lowest level and keep ourselves alive all the time, like the way that people report monthly, or weekly, to keep health information systems alive or used through reporting and assessments....” PO</i>	High
<i>Capacity building at all levels to ensure scalability and continuity of the assessment process</i>	<i>“One is that country leaders need capacity building and more sensitization. Some of these health leaders don’t understand some of this terminology, and the leaders need to be sensitized on the Health Information Systems used for them to give more support.” MoH</i>	High
<i>Identify DQA and M&amp;E planned and include an HIS assessment to provide a cost-effective approach to conducting assessments that can be implemented at routine intervals.</i>	<i>“...also, being flexible in the data collection and in the assessment tool itself and applying scalability to already existing plans like M&amp;E and DQA conducted by partners can be cost-effective and promote continuity of HIS maturity assessment, to address different types of systems sizes and complexities and having a cost-effective approach to conducting assessments...” MoH</i>	Medium
<i>Advocate for increased political will, government ownership, inclusion in strategic plans, and investment into HIS maturity assessments</i>	<i>“I feel like the best recommendation I would have is having the political will for and understanding the need for accurate data, then it is easy to mobilize for resources to ensure that maturity assessments are planned and happening because there is some form of accountability” MoH.</i>	Low

377 **DISCUSSION**

378

379 While HIS leaders recognized the value of having evidence from HIS maturity assessments to  
380 guide them in planning for HIS strengthening, most felt significant barriers to conducting such  
381 assessments. To achieve a functional, optimized, sustained, and strengthened health system, HIS  
382 maturity assessments provide a critical beginning step to a system's performance status,  
383 highlighting areas to integrate, expand, and scale up. Key facilitators to implementing HIS  
384 maturity assessment included coordination, collaborating with existing M&E programs, and  
385 knowledgeable health workers to conduct HIS assessments at all health facilities. Barriers to  
386 implementing maturity assessments include a lack of skilled workforce knowledgeable in HIS  
387 maturity assessments, fragmented HIS systems using expensive infrastructure, and lack of  
388 financing. Addressing these barriers and facilitators is crucial for achieving effective HIS  
389 strengthening and data-driven decision-making in healthcare systems.

390

391 Governance is critical to HSS; maturity assessments, especially participatory assessments, can help  
392 strengthen that. Weak health systems governance in LMICs has resulted in fragmented or ad hoc  
393 health policy formulation, posing challenges in implementing HIS maturity assessments and  
394 impacting efforts to strengthen overall health systems (23,24). For example, leadership and  
395 governance for HIS include having an eHealth Technical Working group that oversees the  
396 implementation of digital health, interoperability activities, and financial resourcing to aid the  
397 implementation of recommendations from the assessment (15,25). Information derived from  
398 maturity assessments can benefit HIS governance in (a) identifying issues, b) providing guidance  
399 for improvement in health systems' policies, and (c) improving efficiency, effectiveness,  
400 performance, and productivity in the whole health system (2). Through participatory planning,  
401 health systems governance leadership in Ghana and Rwanda effectively prioritized areas to  
402 improve in their HIS, supported by strong governance structures (26–28). There is a need for  
403 policies supporting HIS maturity to strengthen systems. For a health system to function optimally,  
404 continuous monitoring and evaluation of the system is required.

405

406 There is a need to grow the knowledge about the value of an HIS maturity assessment. Making  
407 maturity assessments routine and operationalized as part of a strategic vision could increase  
408 demand for sustainable HIS assessments. Efforts should focus on increasing the need for data use  
409 and efficient health systems, thus building the culture of conducting HIS maturity assessments  
410 using integrated and decentralized approaches. First, strengthening the capacity of health  
411 leadership in planning and conducting systems performance monitoring at all health facilities  
412 promotes accountability to health data, increasing data use. When the health team understands  
413 their responsibility and accountability, teamwork is cultivated, which is essential to improving  
414 data use, quality for informed decision-making, policy change, and planning (4,26,29). Second,  
415 having multisectoral HIS steering committees, developing HIS interoperability roadmaps, and  
416 creating a costed work plan could strongly generate the demand for HIS maturity assessments (30).  
417 Participatory planning addresses not only technical aspects but also the cultural, structural, and  
418 governance-related factors to having an effective maturity assessment. Third, when planning HIS  
419 maturity assessment, collaborative efforts should leverage existing M&E systems or services to  
420 co-develop the goals/objectives of the assessment based on country needs, priorities, and  
421 collaborators' implementation efforts (31). The benefits and value of conducting HIS maturity  
422 assessments are realized when the country translates the recommendations into binding policies  
423 and HSS activities.

424 HIS maturity assessments are critical to establishing an evidence base and process for  
425 systematically prioritizing objectives in the health sector. Health programs focus resources, de-  
426 duplicate work, and reduce staff workload, potentially strengthening health systems. Because the  
427 HIS landscape and context will evolve over time, assessments should not be conducted as a one-  
428 time marker but as part of a routine iterative cycle for understanding the HIS, feeding into updates  
429 to the strategic vision, strategic objectives, and action plans for maturity. To achieve this vision of  
430 sustainable HIS assessments, it is imperative that leaders have a shared vision and skilled  
431 champions to plan/implement the activities, financing, and coordination. Investments in health  
432 have been donor-driven and fragmented, particularly in information systems in sub-Saharan  
433 African countries, which has resulted in a lack of shared vision and drivers for HIS assessments  
434 (32,33). To overcome this barrier, sustainable HIS maturity assessments require strong buy-in and  
435 leadership from governments, with sufficient consultations among key stakeholders to support  
436 better planning and implementation of maturity assessments (34,35). This approach can be a  
437 pathway to ensuring the results will be relevant and useful to all critical partners supporting HIS  
438 beyond donor-driven investments and projects.

439

#### 440 *Limitations*

441 Most countries had not conducted an HIS maturity assessment at the time of interviews, so  
442 participant knowledge was based on M&E or demographic health surveys, which did not focus on  
443 HIS. Secondly, most (80%) key informants were from Africa, and all were engaged through eHLF,  
444 so they may not have represented all health system leaders in LMICs. However, we expect the  
445 barriers, facilitators, and recommendations they named would resonate with other LMIC regions.  
446 Thirdly, the research did not ask about the drawbacks of conducting maturity assessments or why  
447 they do not bring value to HIS, strengthening the assumption that health leaders think HIS maturity  
448 assessments are important. Lastly, the structure of questions resulted in confounding responses,  
449 with some participants treating HIS strengthening and HIS assessments interchangeably.

450

## 451 *Conclusion*

452 Strengthening health information systems is vital in improving healthcare for all in LMICs. With  
453 the growing access to technology and increasing demand for digital health solutions, assessing the  
454 maturity of HIS to aid in identifying digital health priorities plays a vital role in improving HSS.  
455 Countries still face challenges in conducting HIS maturity assessments and operationalizing results  
456 to strengthen their HIS. The challenges include lack of prioritization of HIS due to low political  
457 will, a lack of shared vision due to the donor-dependent funding of HIS, and a lack of essential  
458 skills in the health workforce to conduct maturity assessments. Addressing these barriers is crucial  
459 for planning for and executing HIS maturity assessments, potentially achieving effective HIS  
460 strengthening through data-driven decision-making in healthcare systems. Key to planning an  
461 effective HIS maturity assessment includes multi-collaborative engagements, contextualizing to  
462 country needs/priorities, using existing resources/structures or M&E plans, advocating for  
463 government prioritization, and gaining political will. Institutionalizing HIS maturity assessments  
464 as part of HIS governance offers a promise to adopt and build a foundation for having  
465 interoperable, integrated, and sustainable HIS integral to a well-functioning and strengthened  
466 health system.

467

## 468 *Declarations:*

469

470 Competing interest statement: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

471

472 Financial disclosure statement: The study did not receive any funding.

473

## 474 *Data Sharing*

475 All data to the study is stored in a secure folder in SharePoint drive under the University of  
476 Washington. Data is only accessible through a request to the study team. This data can be made  
477 available to reviewers upon request. A link to the dashboard may be made available to authorized  
478 reviewers as it contains patient information that cannot be shared widely according to patient rights  
479 and confidentiality of information regarding health data.

480

## 481 *Acknowledgments*

482 The authors would like to extend their gratitude to all the HIS leaders for their invaluable  
483 contributions instrumental to accomplishing the study objectives. Second, we acknowledge the  
484 support from PATH and the US Centre for Disease Control (US CDC) to the Technical Assistance  
485 Partnership (TAP), which provided support for launching the eHealth Leaders Forum (EHLF).  
486 Lastly, sincere gratitude to the research team who contributed to the successful completion of this  
487 study.

## 488 **References**

- 489 1. ITU [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Digital Health Platform Handbook: Building a Digital  
490 Information Infrastructure (Infostructure) for Health. Available from:  
491 <https://www.itu.int:443/en/publications/ITU-D/Pages/publications.aspx>
- 492 2. Kolukisa Tarhan A, Garousi V, Turetken O, Söylemez M, Garossi S. Maturity assessment and  
493 maturity models in health care: A multivocal literature review. Digit Health.  
494 2020;6:2055207620914772.
- 495 3. Global strategy on digital health 2020-2025. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.pdf  
496 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/g4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf)  
497 [source/documents/g4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/g4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf)
- 498 4. Closing-the-digital-divide-mainReport.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Available from:  
499 <https://transformhealthcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Closing-the-digital-divide->  
500 [mainReport.pdf](https://transformhealthcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Closing-the-digital-divide-)
- 501 5. World Health Organization and International Telecommunication -Union, editors. National  
502 eHealth strategy toolkit. Geneva: World Health Organization [u.a.]; 2012.
- 503 6. Mahama PN jonaam, Kabo-bah AT, Falchetta G, Blanford JI, Yamba EI, Antwi-Agyei P, et al. Leaving  
504 no disease behind: The roadmap to securing universal health security and what this means for the  
505 surveillance of infectious diseases in Ghana as a precedent for sub-Saharan Africa. PLOS ONE. 2023 Apr  
506 24;18(4):e0284931.
- 507 7. Zhao Y, Schalet D, Alsalamah S, Pujari S, Labrique A. From Assessment to Action: Exploring the  
508 Dynamics Between Maturity Assessments and Strategy Implementation in Digital Health. Stud Health  
509 Technol Inform. 2023 Jun 29;305:257–60.
- 510 8. Mirza M, Grant-Greene Y, Valles MPJS, Joseph P, Juin S, Brice S, et al. Leveraging PEPFAR-  
511 Supported Health Information Systems for COVID-19 Pandemic Response. Emerg Infect Dis. 2022  
512 Dec;28(Suppl 1):S49–58.
- 513 9. Brand B, LaVenture M, Baker EL. Developing an Informatics-Savvy Health Department: From  
514 Discrete Projects to a Coordinating Program-Part III, Ensuring Well-Designed and Effectively Used  
515 Information Systems. J Public Health Manag Pract JPHMP. 2018;24(2):181–4.
- 516 10. McNabb SJN, Shaikh AT, Haley CJ. Modernizing Global Health Security to Prevent, Detect, and  
517 Respond. Elsevier; 2023. 572 p.
- 518 11. Ojo A, Tolentino H, Yoon SS. Strengthening eHealth Systems to Support Universal Health Coverage  
519 in sub-Saharan Africa. Online J Public Health Inform. 2021 Dec 24;13(3):E17.
- 520 12. McGuire F, Revill P, Twea P, Mohan S, Manthalu G, Smith PC. Allocating resources to support  
521 universal health coverage: development of a geographical funding formula in Malawi. BMJ Glob Health.  
522 2020 Sep;5(9):e002763.
- 523 13. Tilahun B, Teklu A, Mancuso A, Endehabtu BF, Gashu KD, Mekonnen ZA. Using health data for  
524 decision-making at each level of the health system to achieve universal health coverage in Ethiopia:



- 525 the case of an immunization programme in a low-resource setting. *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2021 Aug  
526 11;19(Suppl 2):48.
- 527 14. Wijayarathne J, Hewapathirana R, Dissanayake VHW. Modification and Validation of a Maturity  
528 Assessment Tool for Public Health Information System Implementations in Sri Lanka. *Stud Health  
529 Technol Inform.* 2022 Jun 6;290:419–23.
- 530 15. Nyangena J, Rajgopal R, Ombech EA, Oloo E, Luchetu H, Wambugu S, et al. Maturity assessment  
531 of Kenya’s health information system interoperability readiness. *BMJ Health Care Inform.* 2021  
532 Jun;28(1):e100241.
- 533 16. World Health Organization. Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: a handbook of  
534 indicators and their measurement strategies [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010  
535 [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/258734>
- 536 17. Kipruto H, Muneene D, Droti B, Jepchumba V, Okeibunor CJ, Nabyonga-Orem J, et al. Use of Digital  
537 Health Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa for Health Systems Strengthening Over the Last 10 Years: A  
538 Scoping Review Protocol. *Front Digit Health.* 2022;4:874251.
- 539 18. Naeem M, Ozuem W, Howell K, Ranfagni S. A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to  
540 Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *Int J Qual Methods.* 2023 Mar  
541 1;22:16094069231205789.
- 542 19. Vaismoradi M, Turunen H, Bondas T. Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for  
543 conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nurs Health Sci.* 2013;15(3):398–405.
- 544 20. Ministry of Public Health of the DRC. National Development Plan Health Informatics 2020-2024.  
545 2020. National Agency for Clinical Engineering, Information and Health Informatics (ANICiS)  
546 (unpublished).
- 547 21. Democratic Republic of The Congo Ministry of Public Health, Hygiene and Prevention. (2022).  
548 Quantified Roadmap of Health Investments Digital. April 2022. (unpublished).
- 549 22. The Kenya Ministry of Health Virtual Academy [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Available from:  
550 <https://elearning.health.go.ke/>
- 551 23. Lal A, Ashworth HC, Dada S, Hoemeke L, Tambo E. Optimizing Pandemic Preparedness and  
552 Response Through Health Information Systems: Lessons Learned From Ebola to COVID-19. *Disaster  
553 Med Public Health Prep.* 2022 Feb;16(1):333–40.
- 554 24. Sherr K, Fernandes Q, Kanté AM, Bawah A, Condo J, Mutale W, et al. Measuring health systems  
555 strength and its impact: experiences from the African Health Initiative. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2017 Dec  
556 21;17(Suppl 3):827.
- 557 25. Fritz J, Herrick T, Gilbert SS. Estimation of health impact from digitalizing last-mile Logistics  
558 Management Information Systems (LMIS) in Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Mozambique: A Lives Saved Tool  
559 (LiST) model analysis. *PloS One.* 2021;16(10):e0258354.

- 560 26. Iyer HS, Chukwuma A, Mugunga JC, Manzi A, Ndayizigiye M, Anand S. A Comparison of Health  
561 Achievements in Rwanda and Burundi. *Health Hum Rights*. 2018 Jun;20(1):199–211.
- 562 27. MEASURE Evaluation . Building a strong and Interoperable health information system for Ghana  
563 2018.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Available from:  
564 [https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/fs-18-275/at\\_download/document](https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/fs-18-275/at_download/document)
- 565 28. Koumamba AP, Bisvigou UJ, Ngoungou EB, Diallo G. Health information systems in developing  
566 countries: case of African countries. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2021 Aug 4;21(1):232.
- 567 29. Ndoungue VF, Tiwoda C, Gnigninanjouena O, Bataliack S, Mbondji E, Labat A. National Health  
568 Observatory: A tool to strengthen the health information system for evidence-based decision making  
569 and health policy formulation in Cameroon. *Health Policy OPEN*. 2022 Dec;3:100085.
- 570 30. Rumunu J, Wamala JF, Konga SB, Igale AL, Adut AA, Lonyik SK, et al. Integrated disease surveillance  
571 and response in humanitarian context: South Sudan experience. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2022;42(Suppl 1):13.
- 572 31. Building a Strong and Interoperable Digital Health Information System for Uganda — MEASURE  
573 Evaluation [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 15]. Available from:  
574 <https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/fs-18-296.html>
- 575 32. Ibeneme S, Karamagi H, Muneene D, Goswami K, Chisaka N, Okeibunor J. Strengthening Health  
576 Systems Using Innovative Digital Health Technologies in Africa. *Front Digit Health*. 2022;4:854339.
- 577 33. Biru A, Birhan D, Melkamu G, Gebeyehu A, Omer AM. Pathways to improve health information  
578 systems in Ethiopia: current maturity status and implications. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2022 Jun  
579 29;20(1):78.
- 580 34. Mbau R, Vassall A, Gilson L, Barasa E. Factors influencing institutionalization of health technology  
581 assessment in Kenya. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2023 Jun 22;23(1):681.
- 582 35. Lane J, Andrews G, Orange E, Brezak A, Tanna G, Lebesse L, et al. Strengthening health policy  
583 development and management systems in low- and middle- income countries: South Africa's  
584 approach. *Health Policy OPEN*. 2020 Dec;1:100010.
- 585