

1 **Opportunities to sustain a multi-country quality of care network: lessons on the actions of**
2 **four countries Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda**

3

4 **Authors:** Seblewengel Lemma^{1*}, Callie Daniels-Howell², Asebe Amenu Tufa³, Mithun Sarker⁴,
5 Kohenour Akter⁴, Catherine Nakidde⁵, Gloria Seruwagi⁵, Albert Dube⁶, Kondwani Mwandira⁶,
6 The QCN Evaluation group, Desalegn Bekele Taye⁷, Mike English⁸, Yusra Ribhi Shawa⁹,
7 Kasonde Mwaba², Nehla Djellouli², Tim Colbourn², Tanya Marchant¹

8

9 **Affiliation**

10 ¹ Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, based in

11 Ethiopia

12 ²Institute for Global Health, University College London, UK

13 ³ Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

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

15 ⁵School of Public Health, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

16 ⁶Parent and Child Health Initiative PACHI, Lilongwe, Malawi

17 ⁷Ministry of Health, Health Service Quality Directorate, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

18 ⁸Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

19 ⁹Bloomberg School of Public Health and Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International

20 Studies, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

21 ***Corresponding author: Seblewengel Lemma**

22 Seblewengel.Abreham@lshtm.ac.uk

23

24 **Abstract**

25 The Quality of Care Network (QCN) is a global initiative that was established in 2017 under
26 the leadership of WHO in 11 low-and- middle income countries to improve maternal,
27 newborn, and child health. The vision was that the Quality of Care Network would be
28 embedded within member countries and continued beyond the initial implementation
29 period: that the Network would be sustained. This paper investigated the experience of
30 actions taken to sustain QCN in four Network countries (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and
31 Uganda) and reports on lessons learned. Multiple iterative rounds of data collection were
32 conducted through qualitative interviews with global and national stakeholders, and non-
33 participatory observation of health facilities and meetings. A total of 241 interviews, 42
34 facility and four meeting observations were carried out. We conducted a thematic analysis
35 of all data using a framework approach that defined six critical actions that can be taken to
36 promote sustainability. The analysis revealed that these critical actions were present with
37 varying degrees in each of the four countries. Although vulnerabilities were observed, there
38 was good evidence to support that actions were taken to institutionalize the innovation
39 within the health system, to motivate micro-level actors, plan opportunities for reflection
40 and adaptation from the outset, and to support strong government ownership. Two actions
41 were largely absent and weakened confidence in future sustainability: managing financial
42 uncertainties and fostering community ownership.

43 Evidence from four countries suggested that the QCN model would not be sustained in its
44 original format, largely because of financial vulnerability and insufficient time to embed the
45 innovation at the sub-national level. But especially the efforts made to institutionalize the

46 innovation in existing systems meant that some characteristics of QCN may be carried

47 forward within broader government quality improvement initiatives.

48 **Key Words:** government ownership, institutionalization, community engagement, adoption,

49 financial sustainability, quality of care, Network, maternal and newborn health, Bangladesh,

50 Ethiopia, Malawi, Uganda

51

52 **Introduction**

53 The Quality of Care Network (QCN) is a global initiative that was established in 2017,
54 motivated by the slow progress of countries in reducing maternal and newborn mortality,
55 especially from preventable causes[1]. Evidence on the lack of equitable access to high
56 quality health services for mothers, newborn and children [2] prompted the publication of
57 standards and guidelines that promote high quality care [3,4]. Support for country-driven
58 action plans for sustainable, high-quality care was recognised as a gap. Under the leadership
59 of the World Health Organization (WHO), QCN was established to address that gap, with
60 eleven participating Network countries namely Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana,
61 India, Kenya, Malawi, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Uganda, and the United Republic of Tanzania. In
62 addition to these country governments and the WHO, QCN also encompassed
63 implementing, technical and donor partner organisations. Together these countries and
64 partners created a platform for learning to understand how to implement and sustain
65 quality of care initiatives at national and sub-national levels [1]. This paper concludes the
66 collection of papers to examine the performance of QCN, focusing on four Network
67 countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda (Supplement 1). Here, we focused on
68 the sustainability of the Network after five years of development and implementation.
69 Despite its importance, the concept of sustainability is not yet well defined and there is
70 inadequate effort to measure sustainability of innovations [5–7]. In this paper we take
71 sustainability of health programs to mean the continuity of a program after the
72 implementation phase [5]. It is important that this continuity be planned alongside program
73 implementation in order for communities to reap the long term benefit of interventions
74 [8,5,9]. Without planning for sustainability, externally funded innovations that do not have

75 strong government ownership are likely to lose momentum and cease to function when the
76 funding agency withdraws or stops its support [9–11].

77 In an attempt to understand and potentially pre-empt this, studies have tried to identify the
78 factors affecting sustainability and scaleup [5,7,10–14]. Building from these,
79 Wickremasinghe and colleagues refined and summarized six actions that a donor funded
80 innovation can implement to promote sustainability. These actions are (1) planning
81 opportunities for reflection and adaptation from the outset (to ensure that innovations are
82 fit for purpose through continuous engagement with government, and relevant
83 stakeholders); (2) supporting strong government ownership with a plan for a phased
84 transition of responsibilities as external partners withdraw (to ensure government support
85 for and commitment to current and future implementation success); (3) motivating micro-
86 level actors (to ensure that the needs and gaps of local level actors are understood such that
87 they are enabled to engage and implement the innovation. In this paper, micro-level actors
88 are health care workers and the supporting team at the lower level of the health system);
89 (4) institutionalizing the innovation within the health system (to ensure that implementation
90 is embedded within existing systems to enhance ownership, efficiency and reduce
91 duplication); (5) managing financial uncertainties (to ensure financial commitment from
92 governments such that innovation costs are included in the government budget plan); and
93 (6) fostering community ownership (to ensure that community groups, for example clients
94 of the health service or community groups, have the opportunity to catalyse the continuity
95 of the innovation through advocacy and ensure accountability in the implementation of the
96 innovation [10].

97 Here we report on the presence or absence of these actions in the context of QCN
98 implementation, reflecting on how the potential for Network sustainability in four countries
99 was affected.

100 **Method**

101 This analysis was part of the multi-country evaluation of QCN, the methods of which are
102 reported in our common methods supplement for our QCN Evaluation collection of papers
103 (Supplement 2). Key aspects of the methods in relation to this paper are summarized here.

104 **Study setting:**

105 The study was conducted in four QCN countries, namely Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and
106 Uganda; the study was started in 2018 except in Ethiopia that joined the study in 2019. An
107 overview of key country characteristics is provided in Table 1.

108 *Bangladesh:* Maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) is a priority agenda for Bangladesh
109 with a population of more than 165 million [15]. According to the national health,
110 population, and nutrition sector plan for the year 2017-2022, the government of Bangladesh
111 has striven to improve the health of mothers and newborns through making home delivery
112 safe, improving access to and utilization of emergency obstetric services, and improving
113 access to newborn and child health care at the lower level of the health system [16]. Since
114 2017, the government of Bangladesh with implementing partners launched the QCN; it
115 currently has 28 learning districts out of 62 districts, where Quality Improvement (QI)
116 activities have been implemented (Table 1).

117 *Ethiopia:* The second most-populous country in Africa, Ethiopia achieved its Millennium
118 Development Goals (MDGs) for maternal and child health [17]. There have been a number

119 of government-led initiatives that explicitly address quality improvement and most recently,
120 the Ministry of Health (MOH) adopted the national maternal and newborn quality of care
121 roadmap for the year 2017-2020 [18]. This roadmap closely aligns with QCN activities which
122 have been implemented in 14 learning districts out of 770 districts [19].

123 *Malawi:* Malawi is less populous compared to the other case study countries [20] (Table 1).
124 Following its success in achieving its MDG target for child health, the MOH in Malawi
125 engaged in initiatives that aimed to improve the health of mothers and newborns. The
126 country established the Quality Management Directorate (QMD) within the MOH to
127 improve service quality, addressed quality of service in its Health Sector Strategic Plan
128 (HSSP-II) and developed its National Quality Policy and Strategy [21]. The MOH along with its
129 partners have been implementing QI interventions in six learning districts out of 28 total
130 districts in the country.

131 *Uganda:* Uganda with a population size of more than 47 million[22] is also striving to
132 improve quality of health service provision to improve the health of mothers and newborns.
133 Uganda's adoption of various components of quality in healthcare dates back to 1994 [23]
134 initially driven by quality management interventions in HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria. In the
135 recent past, the national standards, guidelines, and policies on maternal and newborn
136 health (MNH) quality of care (QoC) as well as the health sector QI framework and health
137 sector strategic plan 2015/16–2019/20 have been developed. The MOH has begun to
138 implement QI interventions in six learning districts out of 111 total districts in the country
139 [24].

140

141 **Table 1: Demographic and mortality characteristics for the four case study countries**

Characteristics	Bangladesh	Ethiopia	Malawi	Uganda
Total population size (million) ¹	166.3	117.9	19.6	47.1
Total number of districts	64	832	28	136
Maternal Mortality Ratio per 100,000 ²	173	401	349	336
Under 5 Mortality Rate per1000 ³	29.3	59	59.1	58.4
Neonatal Mortality rate per 1000 ⁴	17	33	19	19
Date launched QCN	2017	2017	2017	2017
Number of QCN learning districts	28	14	6	6
Number of QCN learning facilities	298	48	25	18

142 ¹ Population size from World Bank 2021 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator>[17,20,22,15]

143 ² Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Malawi MMR estimates from World Bank 2017[25,26]; Uganda
144 from UDHS2016[27]

145 ³ Under 5 MR Bangladesh, Malawi and Uganda(global age -sex-specific fertility and
146 mortality rate 2019) [28]; Ethiopia (Mini-DHS 2019)[29]

147 ⁴NMR Ethiopia (Mini-DHS 2019), UNICEF DATA (2020) Bangladesh, Malawi and Uganda
148 [25,26,29,30]

149

150 **Design:**

151 To explore the actions taken by the QCN actors that affect the potential for sustainability, a
152 thematic analysis [31] of qualitative interview data and observations from the participating
153 four countries and from interviews with global-level actors was conducted.

154 **Data Collection:**

155 Two data collection methods were applied across the four countries (Table 2), described
156 below.

157 *Semi-structured interviews*

158 First, semi-structured qualitative interviews with national (n=122) and sub-national (107)
159 level Network members and key stakeholders were conducted. Several iterative rounds of
160 interviews were conducted in each country, typically at least six months apart, to capture (a)

161 changes in how the Network was operating, (ii) views pertaining to Network activities at the
 162 time of interview, and (iii) follow-up on emerging findings from the previous round. The
 163 participants were recruited purposively by identifying MOH and partner organizations
 164 involved in QCN who could provide rich information about the Network (Table 2).

165 **Table 2: Qualitative interviews and health facility observations completed, by time, in**
 166 **each country.**

Case-study Country	Data collection dates	National interviewee (n)	Sub-national Interviewee (n)	Facility Observation (n)
Bangladesh	1 (Oct 2019 – Mar 2020)	13	7	3
	2 (Oct 2020 – Jan 2021)	14	11	0
	3 (May 2021 – Sep 2021)	10	12	4
	4 (Jan 2022 – Mar 2022)	8	0	0
Ethiopia	1 (Jan 2021– Mar 2021)	8	11	4
	2 (Nov 2021 – Dec 2021)	10	11	3
Malawi	1 (Oct 2019 – Mar 2020)	7	12	4
	2 (Nov 2020 – Jan 2021)	10	7	4
	3 (Aug 2021 – Nov 2021)	9	7	4
	4 (Mar 2022)	2	3	0
Uganda	1 (Nov 2020 – Mar 2021)	7	13	4
	2 (Jun 2021 – Sep 2021)	12	8	4
	3 (Feb 2022 – Mar 2022)	10	5	4

167

168 Concurrently, semi-structured interviews were also conducted with QCN global actors (n=7
 169 in Mar-2021 and n=14 during Nov-2021–Feb-2022). These interviews explored views on
 170 attributes of QCN and its operational strategy and performance that might affect the
 171 sustainability of QCN, among other things (Supplement 2).

172 *Non-participant observations*

173 Second, non-participant observations were conducted. In QCN health facilities, these were
 174 conducted via visits to two well and two least performing QCN health facilities in each case
 175 study country in two to three iterative rounds (Table 2). Well and least performing QCN

176 health facilities were purposively selected through discussion with key stakeholders and
177 review of facility-level maternal and newborn health outcome and other quality of care data
178 (e.g., those used in national schemes). During these facility observations, structured
179 templates were used to capture key processes relevant to the focus of the Network in each
180 country, as well as unstructured notes. In addition, non-participant observations of key
181 national-level and district level meetings were conducted during which processes and
182 priority discussion topics were captured through unstructured notes. These meetings were
183 usually organized by national level actors such as MOH and the schedule and purpose of the
184 meeting was communicated by the host or during partner interviews. Finally, one global
185 level QCN meeting was observed during the study period.

186 **Analysis:**

187 We performed a thematic analysis of the qualitative interviews and observations. A
188 framework approach[32] was used to analyse the data based on a priori themes around six
189 critical actions summarised by Wickremasinghe and others to define the actions that actors
190 at different levels can take to help sustain innovations (table 3). We developed a matrix
191 based on the themes, and codes that fall under each theme were assigned (supplement 3).
192 All the co-authors reviewed and approved the matrix. Then the data was charted into the
193 matrix for each country including the quotes that represent the summary data. We analysed
194 and interpreted the data for each country first and after receiving feedback from each
195 country data lead, the results were further analysed and interpreted, identifying similarities
196 and differences across countries and results were presented using the six sustainability
197 actions. We defined community as patients, clients of the health service, families or
198 members of local community who have stake in the health service provision.

199 Table 3: Six critical actions to help sustain innovations [10]

#	Critical action	Rationale
1	Planning opportunities for reflection and adaptation from the outset	Building in the expectation that there will be a need to continuously learn, reflect and adapt processes can help innovations be fit for purpose in the real world
2	Strong government ownership	Enabling government leadership in planning, inception and implementation strengthens the potential for commitment to, and responsibility for, innovations in the longer term
3	Motivating micro-level actors	Consideration of the needs and preferences of local-level implementers is essential for most innovations
4	Institutionalizing the innovation within the health system	Integration of processes (eg supervision, supply chain, data) within existing systems promotes ownership, reduces duplication, improves efficiency
5	Managing financial uncertainties	Seeking sustained financial commitment from government, e.g. adding innovation costs to strategic plans and budgets, works alongside institutionalization and can help to minimise the impact of system shocks, e.g. a change in government.
6	Fostering community ownership	Community groups can be important advocates for the continuation of innovations and hold leaders to account

200

201 **Ethics**

202 All data collection was conducted after obtaining informed consent, including separate
 203 consent for tape recording. Patients' privacy was respected during hospital observations. All
 204 data is confidential and anonymised. Ethical approval was obtained from the Research
 205 Ethics Committee at University College London (3433/003); institutional review boards in
 206 Bangladesh, BADAS Ethical Review Committee (ref: BADAS-ERC/EC/19/00274), Ethiopian
 207 Public Health Institute Institutional Review Board (ref: EPHI-IRB-240-2020), National Health
 208 Sciences Research Committee in Malawi (ref: 19/03/2264) and Uganda Makerere University

209 School of Public Health- Higher degrees Research Ethics Committee in Uganda (ref: Protocol

210 869)

211

212 **Results**

213 Results are synthesized across the experience of the learning districts and health system of
 214 four QCN countries. We draw on the evidence described in Table 2, in addition to the
 215 interviews and observations with global level actors to identify whether each action was
 216 present and how it influenced the potential for Network sustainability at the scale it had
 217 been implemented at during this investigation. To give a snapshot of experience by country,
 218 we also present a high-level summary of these actions by country (Table 4). Overall, the
 219 evidence from Bangladesh suggested that all sustainability actions were present during QCN
 220 implementation to a certain degree. Other countries experienced more limited engagement
 221 across the set of actions, especially apparent around managing financial uncertainty and
 222 fostering community engagement.

223 **Table 4: Status of the sustainability actions in the four QCN countries**

Sustainability actions	Bangladesh	Ethiopia	Malawi	Uganda
1. Planning opportunities for reflection and adaptation	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow
2. Government ownership with a plan for a phased transition	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
3. Motivating micro-level actors	Green	Green	Green	Green
4. Institutionalizing the innovation within the health system,	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
5. Managing financial Uncertainties	Yellow	Red	Red	Red
6. Fostering community engagement	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red

224 ***Green** represents the weight of evidence suggest the presence of the action on multiple
 225 accounts, if not all. **Yellow** represents that evidence indicates the action to be present to
 226 some degree, but with some vulnerability or weakness. **Red** represents there is no evidence
 227 in the data to indicate the action exists.

228

229 **1. Planning opportunities for reflection and adaptation**

230 All respondent types interviewed reported that opportunities for planning, reflection and
231 adaptation were embedded in the Network approach at the global, national, and sub-
232 national levels, although some vulnerability was described in Malawi and Uganda.

233 At the global level, between countries, respondents recalled the importance of holding
234 repeat, joint international meetings with global partners, held in Malawi in 2017, Tanzania
235 in 2018, and Ethiopia in 2019. These meetings promoted the importance of country
236 engagement with the Network and encouraged learning. A UNICEF respondent working in
237 Bangladesh noted:

238 *“But I was in that [QCN] meeting along with the government the ministry agreed, and the*
239 *team participated in that Malawi workshop. we had highest policy level commitment to*
240 *participant in the QCN network” (Round1-BGD-Partner-01).*

241 However, some respondents commented that there was limited follow-up and support from
242 the global actors to see if the learning at the global level was adopted at the national level.

243 At the national level, respondents acknowledged opportunities for reflection and adaptation
244 from the outset in the form of joint consultative meetings and joint assessments. During
245 these meetings, activities were planned, learning sites selected, and then partner
246 organisations contributions discussed and coordinated. This type of national level
247 engagement was particularly strongly reported in Ethiopia, including the MOH and partner
248 organizations organising a joint quality summit in the country.

249 In all countries there was also evidence that the generic quality of care standards from the
250 WHO Quality of Care framework were adapted to meet the needs of government quality
251 management directorates. A respondent capitalized on the importance of contextualizing
252 interventions at the country level as follows:

253 *“...economically we are different, the setups of the government are different. For instance,*
254 *we take Malawi, and we compare it with South Africa its [implementation] will be totally*
255 *different but the standards will be the same.”* (Round2-Local-MWI-Site 01-Gov’t-01-F)

256 Finally, at sub-national levels in all countries, the restriction of implementation to a small
257 number of learning health facilities, with the intention to foster learning for future scale-up,
258 automatically implied built in opportunity for reflection and adaptation. These learning sites
259 also had opportunities for reflection during the learning forums where health facilities with
260 better performance in QI work shared their experience. However, linkages between
261 reflective learning at national and sub-national levels did not always lead to adaptation in
262 practice, for example in Uganda and Malawi where QCN structures at the sub-national and
263 local level were reported to be less strong respectively.

264 *“At the district level, they have known their part in the Network but at facility level we don’t*
265 *really mention the Network. We mention it during training, but they are not that conscious*
266 *about it, although they know that there are facilities within the district that are also*
267 *implementing and that they need learn and share and thus should hold meetings every*
268 *quarter to come together and learn from each other. The importance of the Network at the*
269 *district level is not so high, it is more at the national level.”* (Round 2-National-UGA-MOH-01)

270

271 **2. Strong government ownership with a plan for a phased transition**

272 All countries demonstrated strong ownership of the QCN, at least in terms of political and
273 normative commitments. However, none of the countries had a plan for transition when
274 QCN partners had completed their contract of implementation.

275 At the global level, there was a push for country governments to take ownership of their
276 respective QI activity. WHO provided technical support, developing guidelines and
277 frameworks such as the LALA (leadership, action, learning and accountability) framework
278 which facilitated the implementation and monitoring of the Network activity at national and
279 sub-national levels. WHO's approach of leadership was also appreciated as being non-
280 prescriptive, actively seeking buy-in and ownership from partners and country governments.

281 At the national level, the MOH of each country took ownership of the QCN initiative and
282 enlisted partner support. In Ethiopia, QCN was reported as the Ministry's flagship program,
283 creating technical committees and organizing partners' efforts. Similarly, in Bangladesh a
284 government academic institution, National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine
285 (NIPSOM) supported MoH in the implementation of the Network, together with other
286 partners.

287 *"The Government has many initiatives especially in the context of quality of care. It's*
288 *basically a government program"* (National_BGD_SAVE_01).

289 However, a vulnerability that was reported across countries was the fact that the national
290 MOH quality directorates worked in isolation; it was thought that better integration of
291 quality across directorates could further strengthen ownership of the Network.

292

293 *"I think one other problem we have in higher offices in the ministry is that programs are*
294 *working in isolation. And we know worldwide that we cannot achieve quality, or we cannot*
295 *make quality improvement if we try to work as individuals. So, the departments need to*
296 *come together and be seen of the ground together and move forward"* (Round3-Local-MWI-
297 *Site 04-HCW-02-F)*

298 Between countries, government ownership was not uniform at the sub-national level. In
299 Malawi, the structure that was established at the national level went to the lower-level
300 health system, down to the community. In Bangladesh, the Civil Surgeons took leadership of
301 the QI activities at sub-national level. But in Ethiopia and Uganda government ownership
302 was relatively weaker at the sub national level. In Uganda, the system didn't cascade down
303 to the lower level of the health system and in Ethiopia a lack of commitment was observed
304 from the regional health system. A respondent from Ethiopia commented:

305 *"We have no role in the Network so there cannot be conflict of interest. We do mentorship &*
306 *coaching at three hospitals. Other than that, the structure is not stretched down. At the*
307 *office level, we are not required to provide support. to be frank the plan is not ours; it is*
308 *MOH's plan."* (Round1-ETH-Local-RHB-08)

309 Although the MOH of the respective countries took ownership of the Network, and activities
310 took place within existing structures, a particular vulnerability was that implementation was
311 usually facilitated by the implementing partners through individual projects.

312 *"... regionalized support like UNICEF is already in certain districts, so they have been*
313 *supporting that work in their districts. That's how it's been working and then Government*
314 *sort of takes the middle piece where if there is capacity building, they support that, although*

315 *other partners have also done their part in capacity building and trainings within their*
316 *budgets.” (Round-2-National-UGA-Gov’t-01)*

317 While the strong ownership and coordination at national level was positive, the more
318 fragmented ownership sub-nationally, and the approach of partners implementing activities
319 on a project basis, limited the opportunity for a phased transition of responsibilities in all
320 countries. Some partners did not have a vision for long term engagement, beyond their
321 current funding, and sub-national leaders did not feel confident that they would have the
322 resources to implement without partner support.

323 *“...you know some other partners just come and then disappear. So sometime other partners*
324 *are inactive, and some partners will come and say, I think our funding has finished. And*
325 *when their funding has finished they just disappear, and they even don’t say anything and*
326 *this has been a problem” (Round2-Local-MWI-Site 02-MoH-03-F)*

327 **3. Motivating micro-level actors**

328 All four countries employed various mechanisms to motivate the healthcare workers and
329 those supporting the work of health facilities at a grass root level in relation to the QCN
330 work. An incentive mechanism in the form of small funding or grants for health facilities was
331 reported in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Uganda as part of the QCN intervention. This
332 incentive approach was appreciated by the respondents because it created an enabling
333 environment for the health workers to be innovative in identifying, prioritizing, and solving
334 problems within their health facility. The incentive was also given to their health facility as a
335 form of reward for the best performer in quality service provision.

336 " They [facility workers] come [to a fair] and participate in a competition. Whose
337 performance is the best according to the report? An award is given according to the [facility]
338 performance. It is given facility wise and inter-district wise." (Round 1 Local-BDG-Site 01-
339 Gov't-02)

340 In addition, several respondents confirmed that the knowledge and skills gained through the
341 extensive training linked to the Network activities further fostered motivation.

342 Nonetheless, despite the positive comments on QCN actions to motivate micro-level actors,
343 two areas of concern were broadly noted. First that while such incentives were observed to
344 positively motivate micro-level actors during this phase of QCN, the use of financial
345 incentives for individuals might not be sustainable in the longer term or if QCN activities
346 were scaled up beyond the current learning areas. And second, if deficiencies in health
347 facility structural quality persisted into the future, or if career progression for health
348 workers was limited, then the QCN actions to motivate the workforce would be weakened.

349 "...there are a lot of demotivators yah? Maybe career paths. Frustrations also come with
350 small issues like infrastructure in which the staff are working in" (Round2-National-MWI-
351 Gov't-04-F)

352 **4. Institutionalizing the innovation within the health system**

353 Implementers in all four countries were keen to work within the existing health system, to
354 avoid creating parallel systems, and to enable the physical environment for QI through
355 investment in existing infrastructure, job aids and guidelines. In each country, Network
356 activities were located within a designated government unit or department that was
357 responsible for health care quality. For example, in Ethiopia, QCN had a designated person

358 at each level of the health system, and activities were coordinated as part of the national
359 plan, with some variation at sub-national levels. In Malawian hospitals, Network activities
360 were integrated in Quality Management Units, working through pre-existing Quality
361 Improvement Support Teams. However, the institutionalization of QI in Malawi was not
362 perceived to be adequate and respondents suggested to have QI as part of the tertiary level
363 education, so that health workers would have adequate knowledge and understanding of QI
364 when they joined the workforce.

365 *“My best bet would be to have as many officers, as many frontline workers playing in quality*
366 *...We should be really thinking about... if graduates are coming straight from college, they*
367 *should already know that quality is built in every clinical program and that it’s not something*
368 *that is separate, but it is part of that clinical training. So, the training in MNH, then QI is part*
369 *of it because quality is eventually what we need... that’s how we serve a customer” (Round3-*
370 *National-MWI-Maikhanda-02-F)*

371 Learning forums and training were thought to play an important role in institutionalizing QI
372 in the health system. The learning forums allowed transfer of knowledge and skill within
373 and across health facilities and these were shared by health workers and managers with
374 their colleagues and remained in the health system. As was the advocacy work that partners
375 carried out to raise awareness about the initiative. An example was reported from Ethiopia
376 of a region that had started to prepare a quality improvement bulletin to give more voice to
377 the Network idea.

378 However, four vulnerabilities emerged that limited institutionalisation efforts. First, the
379 consequences of losing partner support at the end of their funded project period was

380 described as a problem that weakened the Network as MOH struggled to fill the gap and
381 maintain momentum.

382 *“...what scares us most is the question ‘If the partners left, would the initiative continue?’.*
383 *They are very supportive of QI projects. As I said if you go to the district level and observe*
384 *you may observe many QI projects. This is due to the partner organizations. ... Sometimes I*
385 *wonder if the program only lasts as long as those partners exist. Perhaps if they left, I am not*
386 *sure about the continuity. But for now, it is good.”* (Round1-ETH-National-Gov’t-02)

387 Second, respondents mentioned that partner priorities did not always perfectly align with
388 the real-world needs in the country, especially at sub-national levels where de-centralised
389 decision making was needed. As reported in Uganda, multiple partners invested on the
390 same activity when it was known that it was not a priority for the district. A respondent
391 from Malawi also described existing misalignment between partner and government
392 priorities as follow:

393 *“the challenge with our partners when they are coming into they have their own objectives*
394 *to achieve that may be line with what we want but they are coming in the name of quality*
395 *but not on the specifics that we are targeting so thus what I can say over that one”* (Round2-
396 Local-MWI-Site 01-MoH-01-F)

397 Third, some respondents reported fragmentation of implementation according to the
398 presence of different implementing partners who had different organizational missions and
399 vision. This was emphasised by respondents from Bangladesh, where the implementing
400 partners divided the implementing areas among themselves, but activities carried out
401 according to their own pace, with different level of intensity.

402 And finally, the COVID 19 pandemic shifted both emphasis and resources away from the
403 quality improvement activities and tested the strength and depth of institutionalization of
404 the Network activities within the health system. A respondent from national implementing
405 partner in Ethiopia reported that because of the COVID-19 outbreak, their organization had
406 to close all its program including QCN and transferred their budget to COVID-19 response.

407 **5. Managing financial uncertainties**

408 Initial Network initiatives in all countries were heavily supported by implementing
409 organizations through external funding. As seen at the global level, the funding for QCN
410 came primarily from the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation (BMGF) and USAID; the
411 contribution of WHO through its staff time was also noted. At national level, however, some
412 progress of financial commitment from government was observed, particularly for
413 coordination efforts, though less so for implementation, which was mostly still dependent
414 on partner organisation budgets. In Ethiopia and Uganda, there was some evidence of
415 government financial support or budget allocated to QI. And in Bangladesh, several
416 respondents noted the government's long-standing commitment to achieving universal
417 health coverage, consistent with the goals of the Network. Here, where QCN was observed
418 to be particularly well assimilated in government plans, it was impossible to see Network
419 activities separately from government QI actions, creating a strong belief that the
420 government would manage financial uncertainties, as exemplified by a respondent from a
421 partner organization:

422 *"It's a project that you are talking about, but we are not concerned about the time of QCN*
423 *project because the quality improvement initiative that we are doing is part of the*
424 *government plan, there is nothing with that QCN project. Even we don't use this term QCN,*

425 *so this is part of our sector programme. This is the way we are supporting; we are taking it*
426 *forward as part of their operational plan and sector plan. And now they have developed the*
427 *quality strategy and now we'll develop the action plan, and they will go beyond 2022...."*

428 (Round4-National-BGD-Implementing partner-01 F)

429 But other countries expressed concern about the continuity of QCN efforts in the absence of
430 external funding. Although Ethiopia did try to manage interruption of funding when an
431 individual support partner phased out by committing budget to QCN activities, this effort of
432 the government was jeopardised by external shocks such as COVID 19.

433 Similarly in Malawi, a respondent commented about the fate of QCN in the absence of
434 external funding:

435 *"But I find the issue to do with financing more of a cause for us to fail. This is because look at*
436 *all the components of the health system and I find... well... I was trying at this particular time*
437 *to think about the investments that have happened for example in Kasungu, as a learning*
438 *district. How much did government commit to the goal that we reduce the maternal*
439 *mortality rate by fifty per cent in the implementing (of the project) in the nation and districts*
440 *by 2022? If we are to be honest, success of every implementing district was dependant on*
441 *the kind of and the flexibility of partners that are in the district"* (Round3-National-MWI-
442 implementing partner-01).

443 **6. Fostering community ownership and acceptance**

444 All four countries had a system for community engagement, but it was seldomly used for
445 the purpose of the QCN except in Bangladesh and Malawi. Similarly, there was little
446 emphasis on community engagement in relation to QCN at the global level, despite

447 community empowerment being a central pillar of WHO's theory of change for QCN.
448 Community engagement was particularly strong in Bangladesh, perhaps reflecting the
449 relatively strong health system there prior to QCN implementation. Community leaders
450 supported QI work in hospitals and took part in monthly coordination meetings organized
451 by the district leadership; members of the public participated in QI activities through
452 volunteer groups and clubs; partner organizations established suggestion boxes, help desks,
453 citizen charters and community score cards to promote community voice; and government
454 created platforms for community meetings to advocate for quality improvement. All these
455 initiatives were present prior to QCN but had been aligned and adapted for the same
456 purpose. However, few said that the community engagement part is still a working progress
457 and yet to be designed and implemented as part of the QCN work by their implementing
458 organization.

459 *"...WHO has released a stakeholder and community engagement module. And from that*
460 *module we have some ideas and some guidelines; how we should communicate with the*
461 *community for this quality improvement. Right now we are in a process of developing the*
462 *Bangladesh based context module based on that WHO module..." (Round4-National-BGD-*
463 *partner-04)*

464 In Malawi, community engagement was added as the ninth standard in the MNH QoC
465 standards. A formal structure to link the community members with service providers in
466 health facilities was established, called Health Centre Advisory Committee. This committee
467 was responsible not only for promoting accountability but mobilized resources for the QI
468 initiatives. Village Health Committees and Village Development Committees also played a
469 key role in mobilizing resources.

470 *“there is a feedback mechanism where like if clients are not satisfied with the services that*
471 *they are receiving or maybe a certain injustice has happened they do complain to the*
472 *ombudsman and their issues get resolved. The hospital ombudsman also conducts some exit*
473 *interviews where they check the satisfaction level of the quality of services that are being*
474 *offered at the facility. So at the end of the month, the HO produces an exit report on how*
475 *many clients they interviewed, how many were not satisfied with the services and the*
476 *reasons for lack of satisfaction and others things...” (Round2-National-MWI-MoH-06)*

477 However, not all agreed on the extent of community engagement in Malawi.

478 *“.....it was found that standard nine (community engagement) is the one that is not being*
479 *implemented in almost all the districts. There is a big challenge on the one that talks about*
480 *community and accountability... so issues of score card is not done... so it’s almost cut*
481 *across” (Round3-Local-MWI-Site 03-MoH-01-F)*

482 Despite the existence of strong community engagement structures in Uganda and in
483 Ethiopia (for example through the Health Extension Programme in Ethiopia), community
484 involvement did not emerge as a strong component of Network activity. One participant
485 reflected that this might have been an oversight that could subsequently be addressed.

486 *“Then when we come to the stakeholders and community engagement, we are not doing so*
487 *well, UNICEF has done some work to this business of community engagement using Village*
488 *Health Teams [the lowest point of Uganda’s health system]. But there is a gap of not*
489 *engaging the health unit management committees [HUMCs] which bridge the community*
490 *with facilities.” (Round1-National-UGA-implementing partner-03)*

491

492 **Discussion**

493 Our analysis examined the presence of six critical actions to support sustainability of QCN in
494 the limited number of implementation areas in four Network countries. Institutionalization
495 of the innovation with the health system and motivating micro-level actors were found in all
496 countries, while recognising that some vulnerability existed. There was also some evidence
497 of actions taken to plan opportunities for reflection and adaptation from the outset and to
498 support strong government ownership. However, these actions were stronger at national
499 than subnational level. Two actions were largely absent and weakened confidence in future
500 sustainability: managing financial uncertainties and fostering community ownership.

501 Institutionalization of QCN within existing systems was strong in all four countries, and
502 particularly to the extent that QCN in Bangladesh and Ethiopia was recognized as part of the
503 governments' QI initiative, not as a separate entity. The alignment of goals of QCN with
504 country priorities and their desire to improve the health of mothers and newborn in all four
505 countries positioned QCN as a favoured intervention. Building and sustaining institutional
506 capability including the local capability was reported as a means to sustain a scale-up of an
507 innovation [9,33]. However, we also witnessed that institutionalization could be affected in
508 the presence of financial uncertainty as in Ethiopia, poor harmonization of effort among
509 implementing partners as in Bangladesh, and suboptimal alignment of country needs with
510 implementing partners objectives at sub-national level as in Uganda and Malawi.

511 All countries took essential steps in motivating micro-level actors, although the sub-optimal
512 environment in which these actors worked sometimes operated against the motivating
513 actions as reported elsewhere [34]. But QCN was regarded as a beneficial initiative for staff.
514 The training and knowledge and skill sharing sessions were most appreciated sources of

515 motivation together with the financial incentives given to health facilities based on their
516 performance in QI. In many low-and middle-income countries there is an insufficient
517 number of health workforce, including in the case study countries [35]; actions to motivate
518 health workers are important for retention in the health system [11,14]. Training was
519 reported as a source of motivation for health workers in previous studies [36,37] as was
520 improving the environment they operated in [34,36].

521 Opportunities for reflection and adaptation of QCN were embedded in the design with
522 repeat learning forums at all levels. The fact that governments took the initiative to engage
523 in conversations before embarking on QCN activity in all countries created a strong starting
524 platform for country implementation. In addition, country commitment to global initiatives
525 such as the SDGs created a fertile ground for QCN to act as a catalyst to achieve these global
526 commitments. The learning forums and meetings that happened at the global, national, and
527 sub-national level set the stage for country adaptation of QCN, crucial for accommodation
528 of country specific contexts [11]. However, accountability for implementing learning was
529 not optimal everywhere because of weak systems and realising opportunities for learning
530 often relied on external support [38]. Further, more time, effort and engagement were
531 needed at the local level to secure leadership commitment and resource.

532 There was strong government ownership of the QI initiative in all countries [39]. From the
533 start, QCN was not rigidly prescribed by the global actors unlike many donor-funded
534 interventions. But two areas of vulnerability included that government ownership did not
535 extend to all levels of the health system [14,40]; and while there was confidence that QCN
536 would continue to be a government priority going forward, none of the countries had a plan
537 for phased transition from partner support to full government implementation. The lack of a

538 plan for phased transition had already affected the Ethiopia program as some of the
539 implementing partners had already completed their contracted support.

540 Of the two actions observed to be less present, financial uncertainty limited the ability of
541 the four countries to move forward in the absence of continuous support and none of the
542 countries had a financial sustainability plan. This limitation necessarily challenges the
543 question of the strength of ownership by country governments [10,13], but also challenges
544 global partners to ensure that achieving financial security was central to the design. In
545 Ethiopia and Uganda there were some attempts by the government to fill gaps in funding
546 during the QCN implementation period. However, we didn't identify any plan laid out to
547 manage the financial uncertainties, except the strong optimism from respondents in
548 Bangladesh.

549 Finally, engaging the community as a sustainability action received relatively little attention,
550 except in Bangladesh and Malawi where there was some evidence of community
551 engagement to the extent of mobilizing domestic resources for the initiative. However, both
552 Ethiopia and Uganda made little effort to utilize their already well-established community
553 health system [41]. Other studies acknowledged the benefit of engaging the community in
554 such innovative interventions to ensure community acceptance and its sustainability
555 [10,11,14,42]. Defining community engagement or ownership in the context of QCN may be
556 crucial to maximize gain from the community engagement process, especially in the
557 countries where their roles in QCN was not yet defined [43].

558 Strengths and limitations of this study

559 This analysis triangulated data from key partners at the global, national, and sub-national
560 level in the four case study countries that improved the credibility of our findings.

561 Important insights were observed about actions taken that promoted the sustainability of
562 QCN. But the evaluation could only make inference in the context of implementation in a
563 relatively small number of implementation districts, and over a relatively short period of
564 implementation; it did not attempt to engage with sustainability at scale. The framework of
565 six sustainability actions was a useful tool with which to examine whether and how the
566 innovation could be sustained for the longer term, but some co-dependence was observed
567 between actions such that, for example, positive remarks about government ownership and
568 institutionalisation were made vulnerable by financial uncertainty.

569 **Conclusion**

570 The framework of six critical actions to promote sustainability was useful in revealing where
571 progress was made and what more could be done to sustain improvements in MNH
572 outcomes and quality of care. The innovation was observed to be relatively top-down, with
573 the drive being strongest at global and national levels but with much work – and time -
574 needed to embed QCN linked activities at the sub-national level. Crucially, it was revealed
575 that the absence of deliberate action to address financial uncertainty was an obstacle to the
576 sustainability of QCN. Nevertheless, the strong progress made to institutionalize some
577 characteristics of QCN in existing government systems should be supported to avoid any
578 stalling of progress.

579 **Acknowledgment**

580 We would like to thank all study respondents for their invaluable participation in the overall
581 QCN evaluation. We also appreciate the participation of the QCN Evaluation Group, made
582 of: Fatama Khatun, Abdul Kuddus, Kishwar Azad (BADAS-PCP Bangladesh), Gladson
583 Monjeza, Racheal Magaletta, Zabvuta Moffolo, Charles Makwenda (Parent and Child Health

584 Initiative, Malawi), Mary Kinney, Fidele Mukinda (independent researchers, South Africa),

585 Will Payne, Jeremy Shiffman (Johns Hopkins University, USA), Hilda Namakula, Agnes

586 Kyumulabi (Makerere University, Uganda) Anene Tesfa, Theodros Getachew, Geremew

587 Gonfa (Ethiopia Public Health Institute, Ethiopia).

588

589

590

591

592

593

594 Reference

- 595 1 World Health Organization. The network for improving quality of care for maternal,
596 newborn and child health: evolution, implementation and progress: 2017-2020 report.
597 Geneva: : World Health Organization 2021.
598 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/343370> (accessed 10 Jan 2022).
- 599 2 Kruk ME, Gage AD, Joseph NT, et al. Mortality due to low-quality health systems in the
600 universal health coverage era: a systematic analysis of amenable deaths in 137 countries.
601 *The Lancet* 2018;**392**:2203–12. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31668-4
- 602 3 World Health Organization. Quality of care²: a process for making strategic choices in
603 health systems. 2006;:38.<https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43470> (accessed 10 Jan
604 2022).
- 605 4 Quality health services: a planning guide. [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-
606 redirect/9789240011632](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240011632) (accessed 10 Jan 2022).
- 607 5 Hailemariam M, Bustos T, Montgomery B, et al. Evidence-based intervention
608 sustainability strategies: a systematic review. *Implementation Sci* 2019;**14**:57.
609 doi:10.1186/s13012-019-0910-6
- 610 6 Braithwaite J, Testa L, Lamprell G, et al. Built to last? The sustainability of health system
611 improvements, interventions and change strategies: a study protocol for a systematic
612 review. *BMJ Open* 2017;**7**:e018568. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018568
- 613 7 Marimuthu M, Paulose H. Emergence of Sustainability Based Approaches in Healthcare:
614 Expanding Research and Practice. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*
615 2016;**224**:554–61. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.437
- 616 8 Pluye P, Potvin L, Denis J-L. Making public health programs last: conceptualizing
617 sustainability. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 2004;**27**:121–33.
618 doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2004.01.001
- 619 9 Hirschhorn LR, Talbot JR, Irwin AC, et al. From scaling up to sustainability in HIV: potential
620 lessons for moving forward. *Globalization and Health* 2013;**9**:57. doi:10.1186/1744-8603-
621 9-57
- 622 10 Wickremasinghe D, Alkali Hamza Y, Umar N, et al. ‘A seamless transition’: how to
623 sustain a community health worker scheme within the health system of Gombe state,
624 northeast Nigeria. *Health Policy and Planning* 2021;**36**:1067–76.
625 doi:10.1093/heapol/czab063
- 626 11 Spicer N, Berhanu D, Bhattacharya D, et al. “The stars seem aligned”: a qualitative
627 study to understand the effects of context on scale-up of maternal and newborn health
628 innovations in Ethiopia, India and Nigeria. *Globalization and Health* Published Online First:
629 25 November 2016. doi:10.1186/S12992-016-0218-0

- 630 12 Barker PM, Reid A, Schall MW. A framework for scaling up health interventions:
631 lessons from large-scale improvement initiatives in Africa. *Implementation Sci*
632 2015;**11**:12. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0374-x
- 633 13 Wickremasinghe D, Gautham M, Umar N, et al. “It’s About the Idea Hitting the Bull’s
634 Eye”: How Aid Effectiveness Can Catalyse the Scale-up of Health Innovations.
635 *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 2018;**7**:718–27.
636 doi:10.15171/ijhpm.2018.08
- 637 14 Spicer N, Hamza YA, Berhanu D, et al. ‘The development sector is a graveyard of pilot
638 projects!’ Six critical actions for externally funded implementers to foster scale-up of
639 maternal and newborn health innovations in low and middle-income countries.
640 *Globalization and Health* 2018;**14**:74. doi:10.1186/s12992-018-0389-y
- 641 15 Population, total - Bangladesh | Data.
642 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=BD> (accessed 9 Apr 2022).
- 643 16 4th Health, Population and Nutrition Sector Programme (4th HPNSP) Operational
644 Plan (OP), Maternal Neonatal Child and Adolescent Health (MNC&AH) (January 2017 -
645 June 2022). [http://hospitaldghs.gov.bd/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/HSM_OP_2017-
646 22.pdf](http://hospitaldghs.gov.bd/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/HSM_OP_2017-22.pdf) (accessed 26 Jul 2022).
- 647 17 Population, total - Ethiopia | Data.
648 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=ET> (accessed 9 Apr 2022).
- 649 18 Health M of. National MNH Quality of Care Roadmap (2017/18-2019/2020).
650 Published Online First: 1 July
651 2017.<https://repository.iphce.org/xmlui/handle/123456789/738> (accessed 2 Apr 2022).
- 652 19 Ethiopia | Quality of Care Network. [https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/country-
653 data/ethiopia](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/country-data/ethiopia) (accessed 2 Apr 2022).
- 654 20 Population, total - Malawi | Data.
655 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=MW> (accessed 9 Apr
656 2022).
- 657 21 Government of Malawi. Health Sector Transformation Plan II.
658 <https://www.health.gov.mw/index.php/78-demo/slides/199-hssp-2> (accessed 10 Aug
659 2022).
- 660 22 Population, total - Uganda | Data.
661 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=UG> (accessed 9 Apr 2022).
- 662 23 Ministry of Health [Uganda]. The Quality Improvement methods: A manual for
663 health workers in Uganda. 2015.
- 664 24 Uganda | Quality of Care Network. [https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/country-
665 data/uganda](https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/country-data/uganda) (accessed 2 Apr 2022).

- 666 25 Bangladesh (BGD) - Demographics, Health & Infant Mortality. UNICEF DATA.
667 <https://data.unicef.org/country/bgd/> (accessed 9 Apr 2022).
- 668 26 Malawi (MWI) - Demographics, Health & Infant Mortality. UNICEF DATA.
669 <https://data.unicef.org/country/mwi/> (accessed 9 Apr 2022).
- 670 27 Demographic Health Survey, Uganda.
671 <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR333/FR333.pdf> (accessed 15 Jul 2022).
- 672 28 Wang H, Abbas KM, Abbasifard M, et al. Global age-sex-specific fertility, mortality,
673 healthy life expectancy (HALE), and population estimates in 204 countries and territories,
674 1950–2019: a comprehensive demographic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease
675 Study 2019. *The Lancet* 2020;**396**:1160–203. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30977-6
- 676 29 Ephi EPHI-, FMOH FM of H-, ICF. Ethiopia Mini Demographic and Health Survey 2019.
677 Published Online First: 15 May 2021.[https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-](https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-FR363-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm)
678 [FR363-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm](https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-FR363-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm) (accessed 2 Apr 2022).
- 679 30 Uganda (UGA) - Demographics, Health & Infant Mortality. UNICEF DATA.
680 <https://data.unicef.org/country/uga/> (accessed 9 Apr 2022).
- 681 31 Castleberry A, Nolen A. Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as
682 it sounds? *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning* 2018;**10**:807–15.
683 doi:10.1016/j.cptl.2018.03.019
- 684 32 World Health Organization. WHO community engagement framework for quality,
685 people-centred and resilient health services. World Health Organization 2017.
686 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/259280> (accessed 9 Aug 2022).
- 687 33 Walugembe DR, Sibbald S, Le Ber MJ, et al. Sustainability of public health
688 interventions: where are the gaps? *Health Research Policy and Systems* 2019;**17**:8.
689 doi:10.1186/s12961-018-0405-y
- 690 34 Djellouli N, Mann S, Nambiar B, et al. Improving postpartum care delivery and uptake
691 by implementing context-specific interventions in four countries in Africa: a realist
692 evaluation of the Missed Opportunities in Maternal and Infant Health (MOMI) project.
693 *BMJ Glob Health* 2017;**2**:e000408. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2017-000408
- 694 35 World Health Organization. Global strategy on human resources for health:
695 workforce 2030. Geneva: : World Health Organization 2016.
696 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/250368> (accessed 22 Nov 2022).
- 697 36 Willis-Shattuck M, Bidwell P, Thomas S, et al. Motivation and retention of health
698 workers in developing countries: a systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research*
699 2008;**8**:247. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-8-247
- 700 37 Momanyi GO, Adoyo MA, Mwangi EM, et al. Value of training on motivation among
701 health workers in Narok County, Kenya. *Pan Afr Med J* 2016;**23**:261.
702 doi:10.11604/pamj.2016.23.261.8414

703 38 Mwandira. Do Networks facilitate innovation, learning and sharing? Case studies
704 from the Quality of Care Network (QCN) evaluation. One of the Quality of Care Network
705 papers.

706 39 Akter K. Influences on policy-formulation, decision-making, organisation and
707 management for maternal, newborn and child health in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi
708 and Uganda: the roles and legitimacy of a multi-country network², one of the Quality of
709 Care Network papers.

710 40 Shelton RC, Cooper BR, Stirman SW. The Sustainability of Evidence-Based
711 Interventions and Practices in Public Health and Health Care. *Annual Review of Public*
712 *Health* 2018;**39**:55–76. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-014731

713 41 Djellouli N. Effectiveness of a multi-country implementation-focused network:
714 delivery of interventions, processes, and maternal, newborn and child health outcomes,
715 one of the Quality of Care Network papers.

716 42 Iwelunmor J, Blackstone S, Veira D, et al. Toward the sustainability of health
717 interventions implemented in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and conceptual
718 framework. *Implement Sci* 2016;**11**:43. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0392-8

719 43 Sarriot E, Shaar AN. Community Ownership in Primary Health Care—Managing the
720 Intangible. *Glob Health Sci Pract* 2020;**8**:327–31. doi:10.9745/GHSP-D-20-00427

721

722 Supplement materials

723 S1: Text. PLOS Global Public Health QCN Evaluation Collection 2-page summary.

724 S2: Text. PLOS Global Public Health QCN papers common methods section.

725 S3: Table. Data coding and analysis matrix

726