

1 **Primary healthcare capacity in Northwest Ethiopia: Insights through the**

2 **Primary health care progression model**

3 Charlie Tadie Tsehay^{1*}, Nigusu Worku¹, Endalkachew Dellie¹, Wubshet Debebe Negash^{1,3},
4 Andualem Yalew Aschalew¹, Ayal Debie¹, Tsegaye G. Haile², Samrawit Mihret Fetene¹, Adane
5 Kebede¹, Asmamaw Atnafu¹

6 ¹ Department of Health Systems and Policy, Institute of Public Health, College of Medicine and
7 Health Sciences, and Specialized Hospital, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia

8 ²Curtin School of Population Health, Curtin University, Perth, WA, Australia

9 ³National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, the Australian National University,
10 Canberra, Australia

11 Email address

12 CTT: Chatadie78@gmail.com

13 NW: nigusuworku29@gmail.com

14 ED: endalkd.07@gmail.com

15 WDN: wubshetdebe23@gmail.com

16 AY: yalewandualem@gmail.com

17 AD: debieayal@gmail.com

18 TGH: tsegishg27@gmail.com

19 SMF: samrimih21@gmail.com

20 AK: adanedbm@gmail.com

21 AA: asme2002@gmail.com

22 *Corresponding author

23 CTT: Chatadie78@gmail.com

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** Primary healthcare (PHC) systems are widely recognized as essential
26 foundations for ensuring equitable access to quality medical care for all. Achieving the health-
27 related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including the sub-targets of universal health
28 coverage by 2030 requires resilient PHC systems, supported by scientific evidences to inform
29 better policy. However, there is a lack of evidence regarding the PHC system capacity at the
30 operational level in Ethiopia. Therefore, we assessed the capacity of primary health care at the
31 health facilities level in northwest Ethiopia.

32 **Methods:** We used a mixed-method assessment of the PHC capacity guided by the
33 progression model, which includes governance, input, and population health and facility
34 management domains with a total of 33 rubric-based (scaled from 1 to 4) measurement items.
35 We included a total of three primary hospitals and five health centers from Northwest Ethiopia.
36 Key informants interviews, facility observations including guideline and policy reviews and
37 reports, discussion with key stakeholders, were our source of data. Data were independently
38 collected by two groups of assessors (internal and external assessors) and a final score was
39 determined by consensus through panel discussion. Finally, we summarized and synthesized the
40 results over the three domains of PHC capacity assessment and the nine subdomains.

41 **Results:** All the three domains scores were found to be low. We found that the scores were
42 1.5, 2.2, and 1.3 out of four points for the governance, input, and population health and facility
43 management domains, respectively. While we found a better achievement on health management
44 information system and civil registration and vital statistics, the local priority setting, facility
45 management capability, innovation and learning, community engagement and social
46 accountability measures had lowest capacity score.

47 **Conclusions:** Our study highlighted that the governance and population health and facility
48 management domains scored lower at the health facilities in central Gondar zone. Therefore, it is
49 crucial to enhance these domains to strengthen PHC through a comprehensive approach, aiming
50 to meet its targets and achieve UHC by 2030 or beyond.

51 **Background**

52 Primary healthcare (PHC) system is the foundations for guaranteeing that everyone has equitable
53 access to quality medical care[1]. Sustaining a strong PHC system is also crucial for meeting the
54 health-related Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and its sub-targets of universal health
55 coverage (UHC) by 2030 or beyond[2].

56 The Astana Declaration of 2018 emphasized the critical role that PHC must play in achieving
57 UHC and reiterated the international community's commitment to developing PHC[3]. But all
58 too often, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), PHC is ineffective, under
59 prioritized, and unable to fulfill its promise[4].

60 The PHC system, which emphasizes service accessibility by delivering it as near to people's
61 homes and communities as possible, acts as the cornerstone of the health system[5].

62 Accordingly, Ethiopia has taken a number of steps to address the fragmentation of basic health
63 cares through a community-based PHC services.

64 Despite a wide range of interventions aimed at improving PHC capacity, there is limited
65 evidence regarding the impact of primary healthcare system performance across country [6]. The
66 Primary Health Care Performance Initiative (PHCPI) was developed to measure PHC and
67 evaluate PHC systems[7]. Owing to the lack of available data sources and metrics for PHC
68 capacity, PHCPI created the PHC Progression Model, a participatory rubric-based mixed-
69 methods evaluation tool, to measure capacity [8].

70 The lack of resources and practical implementation strategies has created a need to accelerate
71 progress in achieving universal health goals[9]. The health system delivers preventive,
72 promotive, curative, and rehabilitative interventions through a combination of public health
73 actions and a pyramid of healthcare facilities that provide personal healthcare[10]. The PHC
74 facilities play a crucial role in addressing essential health care. Despite limited national-level
75 studies, there remains a lack of evidence regarding the capacity of PHC at the zonal and district
76 level. Therefore, we evaluated the capacity of primary health care at the health facility level in
77 Northwest Ethiopia.

78 **Methods**

79 **Study context**

80 Our study was conducted from March to June 2023 in Central Gondar zone of northwest
81 Ethiopia, which comprises one comprehensive specialized hospital, one general hospital, nine
82 primary hospitals, 76 health centers and 154 health posts. The study focused on three randomly

83 chosen public primary hospitals (Wogera, Sanja, and Qoladba) and five health centers
84 (Ambagiorgis, Makisegnit, Qoladba, Chua hit, and Sanja).

85 **PHC capacity assessment**

86 In our study, to evaluate the PHC capacity, we used the PHC progression model taken from PHC
87 performance initiative[11]. This progression model was recently introduced to systematically
88 guide PHC capacity assessment, with the aim of improving PHC system performance in
89 resource-limited settings and contributing to the achievement of UHC targets in the long run.

90 The capacity aspect of the PHC-VSP evaluates three main elements of primary healthcare:
91 governance, inputs, and management of population health and facilities. The assessment tool for
92 capacity assessment has 33 specific measures derived from the primary healthcare progression
93 model[7].

94 **Data sources and assessment procedures**

95 We used multiple data collection methods from different data sources including key informant
96 interviews, documents (patient charts and registration) reviews, and facility observations (review
97 of facilities' strategic plan, reports). We adapted tools for secondary data collection regarding to
98 surveillance and facility inputs from the Ethiopian Public Health Institute's (EPHI) Service
99 Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA) [12] In addition, we utilized the DHIS 2
100 databases, from hospital and health center levels to address matters related to population health
101 and health facility management.

102 The evaluation process first encompassed an internal review conducted by healthcare facility
103 staff, followed by external assessments carried out by evaluation teams from outside the study

104 areas. The 33 individual measure scores are consolidated into nine sub-scores, each representing
105 a subdomain of the PHC Capacity. These sub-scores are calculated by taking the simple
106 unweight average of the relevant measures. The nine sub-scores are further aggregated into three
107 overall scores—Governance, Inputs, and Population Health and Facility Management—which
108 are displayed in the Capacity pillar of the Vital Signs Profile (Table 1). These overall scores are
109 also calculated using a simple unweight average of the respective sub-scores.

110 **Document review and synthesis:** A PHC capacity assessment team, consisting of two
111 members assigned to each of the eight health facilities. Utilizing different templates specifically
112 developed for the assessment, the team gathered relevant data from different sources.

113 **Key informant interviews:** After review of documents and finalizing the synthesis of
114 secondary data, the assessment team thoroughly identified information gaps and indicators
115 requiring additional verification and clarification subsequently, the team identified key
116 informants based on their exposure and expertise.

117 **Internal assessment**

118 The internal assessors were recruited with in each facility considering their experience. Two days
119 of training was given for internal assessors on data collection tools, study objective, participant
120 handling and other ethical issues, and they have measured the capacity of the PHCs from their
121 respective health facilities using both document review and key informants interview and gave
122 scores for all 33 measures.

123 **External Assessment**

124 We recruited a total of two external assessors, all of whom held master's degrees in public health.
125 The recruitment process was considered the assessors previous data collection and related
126 experience. Prior to the actual data collection, two days training was given for data collectors.
127 Like internal assessors the team gathered pertinent data from their assigned health facilities, and
128 the collected data were combined using a template developed for this purpose. The scoring scale
129 was the same for internal and external assessors (score of 1 to 4 for each measure).

130 **Data synthesis**

131 The external assessment team combined relevant information derived from document review,
132 desk review and key informant interviews related to the 33 measures.

133 This information was briefly summarized and organized into a single document for use in both
134 internal and external assessments. The internal and external assessment teams evaluated the 33
135 PHC capacity measures based on this evidence summary, recording the scores in an Excel file.
136 The findings taken from each data source were documented separately, with clear indications of
137 their sources. Both qualitative and quantitative data from various sources were recorded and
138 combined for each of the 33 measures, using data synthesis template for respective facilities.
139 Scoring in the PHC Progression Model follows a threshold approach, where a performance level
140 is only achieved if all criteria within a measure meet the standards outlined in the corresponding
141 rubric. Each indicator was given rating scale of one to four, based on criteria's taken from the
142 PHC progression model. During rating scale the lowest capacity was considered as one whereas
143 the highest capacity score was scored as four. Subsequently, these scores were aggregated into
144 nine sub-domains and three domains of PHC capacity assessment. In this study, we figure out the

145 summarized findings for each domain and sub-domain of the assessment. The key informant
146 interviews were recorded, then coded, transcribed and translated to be suitable for analysis.

147 **Ethical considerations and consent to participate**

148 Ethical review, approval and clearance were granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of
149 the University of Gondar (Ref.no R/T/T/T/C/ENG./193 /11/2022) and an official letter of support
150 was obtained from Gondar city administration Health Department. Permission letter was also
151 taken from each health facility. All methods were performed in accordance with the declaration
152 of Helsinki. Written informed consent to participate was taken from each study participant.
153 Thereby each respondent signed consent after a brief explanation of the risk and benefits of their
154 involvement in the study. Participants were also informed about their right to withdraw from the
155 study at any time they want and/or to skip questions that they are not comfortable to respond.

156 **Results**

157 **Primary health care progression model vital signs (VSP)**

158 The assessment of PHC capacity in central Gondar health facilities revealed that all most below
159 the expected standard. In the governance domain, the average score is 1.5, out of 4. Regarding
160 the inputs average score domain, 2.2. On the other hand, in the population health and facility
161 management domain, the PHC capacity scored is 1.3 (Table 1).

162 Table 1: The primary health care progression model vital signs in three main domains, central
163 Gondar, Ethiopia, 2023

VSP Capacity Score	Category	Score
--------------------	----------	-------

VSP Capacity Score	Category	Score
Governance	OVERALL GOVERNANCE	1.5
	Governance and Leadership	1.6
	Adjustment to Population Health Needs	1.3
Inputs	OVERALL INPUTS	2.2
	Drugs and Supplies	2.0
	Facility Infrastructure	2.3
	Information Systems	2.7
	Workforce	2.5
	Funds	1.7
Population Health and Facility Management	OVERALL POPULATION HEALTH AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT	1.3
	Population Health Management	1.0
	Facility Organization and Management	1.6

164 Color code: Yellow=2-3 and pink = less than 2

165 **Governance**

166 Four measures namely primary healthcare policy, primary healthcare leadership, social
 167 accountability and multi-sectorial actions were assessed under Governance domain. The
 168 assessment findings showed that Primary health care policies had medium score (3/4) whereas
 169 the rest three measures had low score (1/4) each.

170 **Inputs:**

171 Most of the indicators to assess the input domain were taken from Service Availability and
172 Readiness Assessment (SARA) report since 2028. Accordingly, five main domains were selected
173 for this study. As the finding indicated the fund domain inputs had lost score (1.7/4) whereas the
174 rest four had medium score (2-2.7/4).

175 **Population Health and Management**

176 The characteristics of Ethiopia's health system within the population health and facility
177 management domain are marked by features such as community engagement in health planning,
178 implementation and evaluation. Community engagement is raised through different initiation like
179 Women's health Development Armies, Managing board at health institution as well as
180 community-based health insurance. Two main domains (population health management and
181 facility management) were assessed under population health and facility management. The result
182 showed that both domains had low scores (1 and 1.6/4) respectively.

183 **Comparison of Capacity assessment scores across health facilities**

184 Among the 33 measures in the Primary Health Care Progression Model, only the health
185 information management measure achieved a higher score (3 out of 5 for some health facilities
186 and 3 out of 4 for others), indicating a yellow or green code. However, three measures, namely
187 social accountability, innovation and learning, and empanelment, had the lowest scores across all
188 facilities (Table 2).

189 Table: 2 Individual scores out of four for each measure in the Primary Health Care Progression
190 Model by facility in Central Gondar zone, Ethiopia, in 2023.

Individual Measures	Amba	Giorgis HC	Chuahit HC	Makisegnit HC	Qoladipa HC	Sanja HC	Qoladipa PH	Sanja PH	Wogera PH
1. PHC policies	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	
2. PHC Leadership	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	
3. Quality management infrastructure	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	
4. Social accountability	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	
5. Multi-sectorial action	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
6. Surveillance	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	
7. Priority setting	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	
8. Innovation and learning	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
9. Availability of essential medicines & consumable commodities	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	
10. Basic equipment	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
11. Diagnostic supplies	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
12. Facility distribution	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	
13. Facility amenities	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	
14. Standard safety precautions & equipment	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	
15. Civil registration and vital statistics	4	2	4	3	2	4	2	3	
16. HMIS	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	
17. Personal care records	2	2	2	3	4	3	4	2	
18. Workforce density and distribution	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	

Individual Measures	Amba	Giorgis HC	Chuahit HC	Makisegnit HC	Qoladipa HC	Sanja HC	Qoladipa PH	Sanja PH	Wogera PH
19. Quality Assurance of PHC workforce	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
20. PHC workforce competencies	4	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	2
21. Community health workers	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	3
22. Facility budgets	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
23. Financial MIS	3	2	4	2	1	1	4	3	3
24. Remuneration	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2
25. Local priority setting	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
26. Community engagement	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
27. Empanelment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
28. Proactive population outreach	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
29. Team-based care organization	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	1	1
30. Facility Mx capability & leadership	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2
31. Information system use	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
32. Performance measurement & Management (1/2)	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
33. Performance measurement & Management (2/2) Supportive Supervision	3	4	2	2	3	1	3	3	3

191 Color codes Green=4, Yellow=2-3; Red=1

192 **The PHC progression model main domain scores at each facility.**

193 Governance was better implemented at wogera primary hospital 2.1/4) as compared to other
194 health facilities, the input domain was better implemented at Sanja and wogera primary hospitals
195 and population health and facility management was also better at Qoladba health center (Table
196 3).

197 Table 3: The overall three domains of capacity assessment in Central Gondar, Ethiopia, 2023

	Domains		
Health facilities	Overall governance	Overall inputs	Overall population health and facility management
Ambagiorgis Health Center	1.5	2.3	1.8
Chuahit Health Center	1.7	1.8	1.3
Makisegnit Health Center	1.6	2.7	1.8
Qoladba Health center	1.5	2.3	2.0
Sanja Health center	1.8	2.2	1.3
Sanja Primary Hospital	1.7	2.6	1.6
Wogera Primary Hospital	2.1	2.6	1.5
Qoladba Primary Hospital	1.6	2.4	1.3

198 **Summarized internal, external and consensus scores with respective average scores**

199 Among primary health care capacity measures, the lowest average internal assessment score was
200 1 out of 4 (social accountability multi-sectorial action, and innovation and learning whereas the
201 highest score was 3.1 (Surveillance Health Management Information Systems, and personal

202 recorders). The highest average external as well as average consensus score was 3.38 (Health
203 Management Information Systems).

204 Almost the final internal and external assessment scores were similar and they agreed on the
205 score either consensus or on average score on eight health facilities (Table 4)

206 Table 4: Final internal, external and consensus and average scores of each PHC measure central
207 Gondar Ethiopia, 2023 (Summary of 8 HFs).

Individual Measures	Final	internal	score	Final	external	Final	consensu	Average	internal	Average	external	Average	consensu
Primary health care policy	21		21		21			2.625	2.625		2.625		
Primary health care leadership	14		13		13			1.75	1.625		1.625		
Quality management infrastructure	19		17		17			2.375	2.125		2.125		
Social Accountability	10		9		9			1.25	1.125		1.125		
Multi sectorial action	8		8		8			1	1		1		
Surveillance	25		21		21			3.125	2.625		2.625		
Priority setting	10		9		9			1.25	1.125		1.125		
Innovation and learning	8		8		8			1	1		1		
Availability of Essential medicines & consumable commodities	19		17		18			2.375	2.125		2.25		
Basic equipment	18		15		15			2.25	1.875		1.875		
Diagnostic supply	16		16		16			2	2		2		
Facility distribution	17		15		15			2.125	1.875		1.875		
Facility Amenities	20		20		20			2.5	2.5		2.5		

Individual Measures	Final	internal	score	Final	external	Final	consensu	Average	internal	Average	external	Average	consensu
Standard safety precaution and equipment	22		21		21			2.75		2.625		2.625	
Civil Registration and vital statistics	22		24		24			2.75	3			3	
Health Management Information Systems	25		27		27			3.125		3.375		3.375	
Personnel care record	25		22		22			3.125	2.75			2.75	
Workforce density and distribution	21		21		21			2.625		2.625		2.625	
Quality assurance of PHC workforce	18		16		16			2.25	2			2	
PHC workforce competency	22		22		24			2.75		2.75		3	
Community health workers	21		14		15			2.625	1.75			1.875	
Facility budget	22		21		21			2.75		2.625		2.625	
Financial Management information system	18		18		20			2.25		2.25		2.5	
Remuneration	15		12		12			1.875	1.5			1.5	
Local priority setting	10		11		10			1.25		1.375		1.25	
Community engagement	12		10		10			1.5		1.25		1.25	
Empanelment	8		10		8			1		1.25		1	
Proactive population out reach	11		11		11			1.375		1.375		1.375	
Team based care organization	15		18		17			1.875		2.25		2.125	
Facility management capability and leadership	13		11		10			1.625		1.375		1.25	
Information system use	15		15		15			1.875		1.875		1.875	
Performance Measurement and Management	15		14		14			1.875		1.75		1.75	

Individual Measures			Final	internal	score	Final	external	Final	consensu	Average	internal	Average	external	Average	consensu
Performance	Measurement	and								2.5		2.625			2.625
Management supportive supervision			20			21		21							
Total			555			528		529		69.375		66			66.125

208 **The primary health care progression model subdomains measure scores out of 4 points.**

209 The subdomain measures scored by internal and external scorers were: Governance and
 210 Leadership, Adjustment to Population Health Needs, Drugs and Supplies, Facility Infrastructure,
 211 Information Systems, Workforce, Funds, Population Health Management, and Facility
 212 Organization and Management. (Table 5)

213 Table 5: Primary health care progression model subdomain measure scores out of 4 points
 214 Central Gondar, Ethiopia, 2023

Category	Measure	Internal Score	External Score	Final Score
Governance and Leadership	Primary health care policies	3	3	3
	Primary health care Leadership	2	1	1
	Quality management infrastructure	3	2	2
	Social accountability	2	1	1
	Multi-sectorial action	1	1	1
Adjustment to Population Health Needs	Surveillance	3	2	2
	Priority Setting	2	1	1
	Innovation and Learning	1	1	1

Drugs and Supplies	Availability of essential medicines and consumable commodities	3	2	2
	Basic equipment	3	2	2
	Diagnostic supplies	2	2	2
Facility Infrastructure	Facility Distribution	3	2	2
	Facility amenities	3	3	3
	Standard Safety Precautions and Equipment	3	2	2
Information Systems	Civil Registration and Vital Statistics	2	3	3
	Health Management Information Systems (HMIS)	2	3	3
	Personal Care Records	3	2	2
Workforce	Workforce Density and Distribution	3	3	3
	Quality assurance of PHC workforce	2	2	2
	PHC workforce competencies	2	3	3
	Community Health Workers	3	2	2
Funds	Facility budgets	2	1	1
	Financial Management Information System	3	2	3
	Remuneration	2	1	1

Population Health Management	Local priority setting	1	2	1
	Community engagement	2	1	1
	Empanelment	1	2	1
	Proactive Population Outreach	1	1	1
Facility Organization and Management	Team-based care organization	3	2	2
	Facility management capability and leadership	2	1	1
	Information system use	2	2	2
	Performance measurement and management	3	2	2
	Supportive Supervision	2	1	1

215 Discussion

216 This study evaluated the capacity of PHC in health facilities in Central Gondar zone using the
 217 PHC progression model. The results indicated a generally low level of PHC capacity across all
 218 assessed domains. Significantly, the capacity in the population health and facility management
 219 domain was found to be particularly lacking. While the input domain exhibited low scores as
 220 well, it was comparatively better than those of the population health management and
 221 governance domains. These findings highlight critical areas for improvement in PHC capacity,
 222 especially in governance and population health and facility management aspects, which are
 223 essential for enhancing overall health system performance.

224 Utilizing the PHC progression model, the study showed that the overall capacity of health
 225 facilities was 1.5 out of 4 in the governance domain, 2.2 out of 4 in the input's domain, and 1.3

226 out of 4 in the population health and facility management domain. This finding is low compared
227 to the national level study in Ethiopia, however, the scores of input was similar from the Ministry
228 of Health assessment of capacity[13].

229 **Governance**

230 The Governance domain of the study achieved an average score of 2.2 out of 4, which is
231 categorized as a medium score according to the Primary Health Care (PHC) progression model.
232 This score is notably lower than the findings of a national level study in Ethiopia, which reported
233 an average score of 2.8 out of 4 [14] , and a study conducted in Qatar that scored 3.6 out of 4
234 [15].

235 The observed differences in scores may be attributed to variations in the study settings; the
236 previous studies were conducted at a national level focusing on regional offices, while our study
237 was performed at the facility level. The implications of our findings suggest potential issues such
238 as the unavailability of essential policies and strategies, lack of social accountability, inadequate
239 handling of quality documents, violations of rules and regulations, and the absence of quality
240 improvement projects and capacity-building training. These factors may contribute to the
241 suboptimal performance of health facilities [4].

242 The study assessed eight governance measures in health care including primary health care
243 policy, primary healthcare leadership, social accountability, multi-sectorial action, quality
244 management infrastructure, surveillance, priority setting and innovation and learning. Among
245 these only three domains; primary healthcare leadership, quality management infrastructure and
246 surveillance scored 2 or above out of 4, indicating medium level performance. The remaining
247 domains scored 1 out of 4, highlighting that over 60% of the governance areas are poorly

248 functioning and require urgent attention. The findings suggest that without prompt action from
249 the health care government in central Gondar zone, significant impairments in health service
250 delivery may occur due to limited leader- workers interaction, poor community engagement,
251 inadequate collaboration with public organizations, and in effective participatory decision
252 making[16]. District and zonal health offices must address these gaps urgently and collaborate
253 with health facilities [17]. Evidences indicated that the capacity building training, organizational
254 restructuring, and fostering a positive social environment can enhance leadership capacities in
255 health facilities[18].

256 **Inputs**

257 The input dimension of PHC capacity received an overall score of 2.2 out of 4, indicating a
258 medium level performance. Within this dimension, the lowest score was 1.7, attributed to
259 funding, while the highest score was 2.7, related to information system.

260 In this study, the financial aspect of the domain received the lowest score among all subdomains.
261 Suggest that delivering quality health services is challenging due to the dynamic nature of
262 healthcare, which requires constant adaptation to emerging patient needs, new technologies, and
263 changing environments. Evidences indicate that robust healthcare budget is crucial for leaders to
264 effectively plan for the future and prioritize care across various departments and programs,
265 ultimately enabling health care organizations to provide more efficient and effective patient care
266 [19]. Healthcare budgeting plays a vital role in decision making with in health system and
267 organizations. An effective budgeting process enables health care leaders to align daily
268 operations with financial targets, prioritize key areas in line with strategic goals and manage
269 capital expenditures and cash flow efficiently. Additionally, it provides a clear understanding of

270 funding allocation for individual projects, initiatives and clinical departments, while also helping
271 to minimize purchasing errors[20].

272 The study identified several budget related challenges faced by health centers and hospitals in
273 central Gondar zone. These challenges include unpredictable economic events such as the
274 COVID 19 pandemic and conflicts which render static budgets ineffective. Other issues include
275 changes or delay in reimbursement and payment models, labor shortage, rising costs and supply
276 chain disruptions, particularly shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE) and prescribed
277 drugs. In addition, external factors such as fluctuation in patient volume and inflation also
278 significantly impact health care budget[21].

279 In the input domain, the availability of essential medicines and consumable commodities
280 received score of 2 and 3 out of 4 across all facilities, categorizing them at the “yellow level.”
281 This finding aligns with a systematic review conducted in low and middle income countries[22].
282 Stock-outs of medical consumables adversely affect health outcomes by delaying effective
283 service delivery and discouraging patients from seeking care. The study also revealed low
284 availability of fully functioning basic equipment, with Ambagiorgis health center scoring “red”
285 (1/4) and other facilities scoring “yellow” (2/4). This outcome is consistent with a study from
286 Jimma, Ethiopia, which found that one-third of basic equipment was unavailable [23].

287 The civil registration and vital statistics measure achieved a "green level" score (4/4) at
288 Ambagiorgis, Makisegnit, and Qoladba health centers, indicating a high level of performance in
289 these facilities. In contrast, other health facilities only reached a "yellow level," suggesting room
290 for improvement. This disparity may be linked to the government's prioritization of civil

291 registration and vital statistics, along with effective collaboration between health facilities and
292 government administration offices in Ethiopia.

293 Additionally, the Management and Health Information Systems (MHIS) measure demonstrated
294 strong performance, achieving a "green level" score (4/4) at three health facilities and a "yellow
295 level" (3/4) at five others. This performance is consistent with findings from a study conducted
296 in public hospitals across Ethiopia[24], although it surpasses results from a study in the Oromia
297 zone. The variation in results may stem from the different study tools employed; our study
298 utilized indicators from the PHC Progression Model, while the previous study relied on
299 indicators from national HMIS guidelines[25].

300 **Population health and facility management**

301 The population health and facility management domain of primary health care (PHC) received a
302 low overall score of 1.3 out of 4. Nine measures were evaluated by both internal and external
303 assessors, with the final scores reached by consensus. Only three measures—team-based care,
304 information system use, and performance measurement—scored medium based on primary
305 health care progression models. In contrast, several critical measures, including local priority
306 setting, community engagement, proactive population outreach, empanelment, and supportive
307 supervision, were poorly implemented in the study area, highlighting significant gaps in health
308 system priorities[4].

309 The findings indicate that local community health issues are often overlooked, leading to
310 decision-making and resource allocation being influenced more by historical and political factors
311 than by technical knowledge or an understanding of current health needs [26]. Community

312 engagement, recognized by the World Health Organization as a key measure of primary health
313 care capacity, is highlighted as a cost-effective strategy for promoting health and preventing
314 illness. Although there are no direct comparative studies, various preliminary findings and
315 reports from international organizations emphasize the importance of community engagement in
316 local health governance. Active participation of residents not only enhances democratic
317 governance but also increases their support for health initiatives. Moreover, community
318 engagement fosters strong, cohesive communities where residents feel connected and supported.
319 This sense of belonging can reduce social isolation, increase cooperation, and promote a spirit of
320 mutual aid and collective responsibility. It also enables local governments to create more
321 sustainable and inclusive policies, as engaged communities are more likely to support and
322 participate in initiatives related to environmental conservation, economic development, and
323 social well-being.

324 During crises, communities that are actively engaged are more capable of responding effectively
325 to challenges such as natural disasters, economic difficulties, or public health emergencies.
326 Additionally, community engagement fosters a sense of ownership among residents in local
327 governance, resulting in increased civic pride, higher volunteerism, and a more dynamic
328 citizenry [27]. However, our findings indicate that the level of implementation in the central
329 Gondar zone is low (1 out of 4). Specifically, there have been no community forums, campaigns,
330 or activities aimed at building trust between the community and the health system. These
331 shortcomings may be attributed to issues of insecurity and the adverse effects of the COVID-19
332 pandemic.

333 **Acknowledgement**

334 We authors would like to thank to the University of Gondar, internal and external assessors for
335 devoting their time and commitment, the study participants for providing information and their
336 patience

337 **Authors' contribution**

338 **Conceptualization:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Tsegaye G. Haile, Nigusu Worku, Asmamaw Atnafu.

339 **Data curation:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Nigusu Worku, Wubshet Debebe Negash

340 **Formal analysis:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Nigusu Worku

341 **Methodology:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Tsegaye G.Haile, Endalkachew Delie,Wubesht Debebe
342 Negash,Andualem Yalew Aschalew , Ayal Debie, Samrawit Mihret Fetene,Adana Kebede,
343 Asmamaw Atnafu

344 **Validation:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Tsegaye G.Haile, Endalkachew Delie,Wubesht
345 Debebe,Nigusu Worku, Asmamaw Atnafu

346 **Visualization:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Tsegaye G.Haile, Endalkachew Delie,Wubesht
347 Debebe Negash,Andualem Yalew Aschalew , Ayal Debie, Samrawit Mihret Fetene,Adana
348 Kebede, Asmamaw Atnafu

349 **Writing original draft:** Chalie Tadie Tsehay, Nigusu Worku

350 **References**

- 351 1. Tesema AG, Abimbola S, Mulugeta A, Ajisehiri WS, Narasimhan P, Joshi R, Peiris D: **Health**
352 **system capacity and readiness for delivery of integrated non-communicable disease services**
353 **in primary health care: a qualitative analysis of the Ethiopian experience.** *PLOS Global Public*
354 *Health* 2021, **1**(10):e0000026.
- 355 2. Organization WH: **Primary health care measurement framework and indicators: monitoring**
356 **health systems through a primary health care lens. Web annex: technical specifications.** 2022.
- 357 3. Friedrich M: **Declaration of Astana emphasizes primary care as key to world health.** *JAMA*
358 2018, **320**(23):2412-2412.
- 359 4. Ratcliffe HL, Schwarz D, Hirschhorn LR, Cejas C, Diallo A, Garcia-Elorrio E, Fifield J, Gashumba D,
360 Hartshorn L, Leydon N *et al*: **PHC Progression Model: a novel mixed-methods tool for**
361 **measuring primary health care system capacity.** *BMJ Global Health* 2019, **4**(5):e001822.
- 362 5. Pettigrew LM, De Maeseneer J, Anderson M-IP, Essuman A, Kidd MR, Haines A: **Primary health**
363 **care and the Sustainable Development Goals.** *The Lancet* 2015, **386**(10009):2119-2121.
- 364 6. Liu L, Desai MM, Fetene N, Ayehu T, Nadew K, Linnander E: **District-level health management**
365 **and health system performance: the Ethiopia primary healthcare transformation initiative.**
366 *International journal of health policy and management* 2022, **11**(7):973.
- 367 7. Ratcliffe HL, Schwarz D, Hirschhorn LR, Cejas C, Diallo A, Garcia-Elorrio E, Fifield J, Gashumba D,
368 Hartshorn L, Leydon N: **PHC Progression Model: a novel mixed-methods tool for measuring**
369 **primary health care system capacity.** *BMJ global health* 2019, **4**(5):e001822.
- 370 8. Al-Kuwari MG, Abdulmajeed J, Kandy MC, Al-Mudahka H, Al-Abdulla S, Al-Mujalli H, Tarazi A,
371 Abdulmalik MA: **Primary health care capacity assessment in Qatar: the primary health care**
372 **progression model as an assessment method.** *MIDDLE EAST JOURNAL OF FAMILY MEDICINE*
373 2023, **7**(10).
- 374 9. Organization WH: **The Delivery of essential health service in Africa, realities and people's**
375 **perceptions and perspectives: report submitted for the North West site in Nigeria.** 2011.
- 376 10. Organization WH: **Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: a handbook of indicators**
377 **and their measurement strategies:** World Health Organization; 2010.
- 378 11. Ramli AS, Taher SW, Zakaria ZF, Ali N, Shamsuddin NH, Wong PF, Talib NH, Ismail SB: **The**
379 **primary health care performance initiative (PHPCI): issues and challenges for Malaysia as a**
380 **trailblazer country.** *Journal of Clinical and Health Sciences* 2019, **4**(1):1-18.
- 381 12. Ethiopian Public Health Institute Addis Ababa E: **Ethiopia Service Availability and Readiness**
382 **Assessment (SARA).** 2018 Final Report.
- 383 13. Yitbarek K, Serawit A, Medhin G, Alemayehu YK, Teklu AM, Assefa Y, Haregu TN: **Capacity of the**
384 **Ethiopian primary health care system to achieve universal health coverage: a primary health**
385 **care progression approach.** *Health policy and planning* 2023, **38**(4):474-485.
- 386 14. Yitbarek K, Serawit A, Medhin G, Alemayehu YK, Teklu AM, Assefa Y, Haregu TN: **Capacity of the**
387 **Ethiopian primary health care system to achieve universal health coverage: a primary health**
388 **care progression approach.** *Health Policy Plan* 2023, **38**(4):474-485.
- 389 15. Al-Kuwari M, Abdulmajeed J, Kandy M, Al-Mudahka H, Al-Abdulla S, Al-Mujalli H, Tarazi A,
390 Abdulmalik M: **Primary health care capacity assessment in Qatar: the primary health care**
391 **progression model as an assessment method.** *World Family Medicine Journal /Middle East*
392 *Journal of Family Medicine* 2023.
- 393 16. McMurray A: **Leadership in primary health care: an international perspective.** *Contemp Nurse*
394 2007, **26**(1):30-36.
- 395 17. Desta BF, Abitew A, Beshir IA, Argaw MD, Abdlkader S: **Leadership, governance and**
396 **management for improving district capacity and performance: the case of USAID transform:**
397 **primary health care.** *BMC Family Practice* 2020, **21**(1):252.

- 398 18. Flahault D, Roemer MI, World Health O: **Leadership for primary health care : levels, functions,**
399 **and requirements based on twelve case studies / Daniel Flahault, Milton I. Roemer.** In.
400 Geneva: World Health Organization; 1986.
- 401 19. Alebachew A, Abdella E, Abera S, Dessie E, Mesele T, Mitiku W, Muñoz R, Opuni M, Teplitskaya
402 L, Walker DG *et al*: **Costs and resource needs for primary health care in Ethiopia: evidence to**
403 **inform planning and budgeting for universal health coverage.** *Front Public Health* 2023,
404 **11**:1242314.
- 405 20. Anderson DM, Cronk R, Best L, Radin M, Schram H, Tracy JW, Bartram J: **Budgeting for**
406 **environmental health services in healthcare facilities: a ten-step model for planning and**
407 **costing.** *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2020, **17**(6):2075.
- 408 21. Gaspar K, Portrait F, van der Hijden E, Koolman X: **Global budget versus cost ceiling: a natural**
409 **experiment in hospital payment reform in the Netherlands.** *The European Journal of Health*
410 *Economics* 2020, **21**(1):105-114.
- 411 22. Olaniran A, Briggs J, Pradhan A, Bogue E, Schreiber B, Dini HS, Hurkchand H, Ballard M: **Stock-**
412 **outs of essential medicines among community health workers (CHWs) in low- and middle-**
413 **income countries (LMICs): a systematic literature review of the extent, reasons, and**
414 **consequences.** *Human Resources for Health* 2022, **20**(1):58.
- 415 23. Ademe BW, Tebeje B, Molla A: **Availability and utilization of medical devices in Jimma zone**
416 **hospitals, Southwest Ethiopia: a case study.** *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016, **16**:287.
- 417 24. Tesfamichael A, Samuel S, Senait S: **Implementation Level of Health Management Information**
418 **System Program in Governmental Hospitals of Ethiopia.** *International Journal of Intelligent*
419 *Information Systems* 2019, **8**(2):52-57.
- 420 25. Bogale A: **Implementation status of health management information system in hospitals of**
421 **South West Shoa Zone, Oromia, Central Ethiopia.** *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research*
422 2021:1-8.
- 423 26. Mitton C, Donaldson C: **Health care priority setting: principles, practice and challenges.** *Cost Eff*
424 *Resour Alloc* 2004, **2**(1):3.
- 425 27. Holzer JK, Ellis L, Merritt MW: **Why we need community engagement in medical research.**
426 *Journal of Investigative Medicine* 2014, **62**(6):851-855.

427