

3 **Title:** Leadership and Governance, Financing, and Coordination and their Impact on the
4 Operationalization of Health Interventions in the Humanitarian-Development Nexus in South Sudan

5

6

7

8 **Authors**

9 Amany Qaddour¹, Lauren Yan², Dan Wendo³, Laura Elisama³, Christopher Lindahl⁴, and Paul Spiegel¹

10 1. Center for Humanitarian Health, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg
11 School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

12 2. Department of Mental Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD,
13 USA

14 3. MOMENTUM Integrated Health Resilience, Corus International/IMA World Health, Juba, South
15 Sudan

16 4. MOMENTUM Integrated Health Resilience, Pathfinder International, Washington, DC, USA

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 South Sudan ranks among the most fragile nations in the world. Protracted conflict and recurrent shocks
19 have weakened its health system and contributed to high maternal and child mortality rates, despite large
20 amounts of humanitarian and development assistance injected into the country since independence. Factors
21 related to the leadership and governance, financing, and coordination of health services impact the
22 feasibility of implementing the humanitarian-development nexus (HDN). Researchers employed a
23 qualitative case study design drawing from document reviews and individual and group semi-structured
24 interviews with humanitarian and development stakeholders in South Sudan (Juba capital and Bor town).
25 Data was analyzed and findings were synthesized and organized into distinct themes. Forty-one interviews
26 were conducted with 68 participants between November 2022 and January 2023, and 57 documents were
27 analyzed. Findings showed that limited government investment in the health sector has perpetuated reliance
28 on international assistance, and barriers to engagement with government counterparts have restricted
29 coordination. Some nascent HDN coordination platforms exist with minimal political buy-in. Recent
30 reductions in development health funding have complicated progress towards longer-term development
31 objectives, including health systems strengthening. Structural barriers within multi-mandate agencies and
32 differences in programming cycles, funding, and reporting contribute to silos. Continued fragility, a
33 restricted operational environment, shrinking funds, and fragmented coordination have made it challenging
34 to plan, finance, and implement HDN-health interventions. Informal efforts to bridge silos between
35 humanitarian and development actors should become more formalized to use resources more efficiently.
36 Despite certain restrictions in engagement with government, coordination and planning at the sub-national
37 level may still be feasible. Such engagement should be enhanced to ensure sustainability of health services.
38 Investment in health systems strengthening and resilience by humanitarian and development actors should
39 enable communities to absorb recurrent shocks and prevent backsliding in health provision.

40 INTRODUCTION

41 After conflict spanning decades, South Sudan declared independence from Sudan in July 2011 (1).
42 Efforts have been underway to mediate intermittent conflicts, including the signing of various agreements
43 and the establishment of the Transitional Government of National Unity in February 2020, which was
44 extended to 2025 (1). The United Nations Peacekeeping Mission for South Sudan was formally established
45 in 2011, and still remains (2). The Transitional Constitution outlined a decentralized structure consisting of
46 the state, county, payam, and boma levels, however, authority and decision-making power are centralized
47 at the federal level in Juba (3).

48 Since 2014, numerous targeted sanctions have been imposed by the United Nations (UN) and
49 several governments, including the United States, on various individuals in government and the private
50 sector involved in human rights violations, corruption, or obstruction to the Revitalized Agreement (4,5).
51 A lack of transparency by the government has consistently placed South Sudan in the top five countries of
52 the Corruptions Perception Index since 2017 (6). These factors have limited partnership with the
53 government by international actors, particularly institutional donors. Donor restrictions for paying
54 government personnel, often termed “zero-cash” policies, have had a critical impact on financial
55 transactions with government line ministries (7).

56 In 2023, South Sudan was ranked third on the Fragile States Index (8). Recurrent shocks and
57 stresses continue to plague the population, including violence, poverty, flooding, droughts, acute food
58 insecurity, and endemic and epidemic diseases (1,9). The COVID-19 pandemic and looming threat of Ebola
59 (since 2022) and Mpox have further exacerbated the fragility of its health system (9,10). In 2023, nearly 2
60 million people were internally displaced in South Sudan and another 2.3 million people sought refuge
61 outside of the country (11). South Sudan also hosts over 330,000 refugees from neighboring countries,
62 mostly from Sudan (11). As a consequence of these compounded factors, development has been hindered
63 and humanitarian needs are tremendous with over 6.8 million people (roughly 76% of the population) in
64 need of such assistance as of 2023 (representing a 4% increase from 2022) (12,13). Of these, 6.1 million

65 people were in need of health assistance (12). Health indicators are some of the poorest globally with
66 maternal mortality at 1,223 deaths per 100,000 live births and under 5 years and neonatal mortality at 99
67 and 40 deaths per 1,000 live births, respectively (see **S1 Table** in supporting information) (14–18).

68 The Ministry of Health (MoH) formally governs the health system with national health policies in
69 place (19). Government contribution to the annual health budget averaged between 1-2% from 2011 to 2019
70 and commitments increased to 9.6% in 2021-2022, in part due to the COVID-19 pandemic, though there
71 have been concerns around whether the government will actually contribute what it has committed (20–
72 22). Current health budget allocations also represent a much lower commitment than what was outlined in
73 the Abuja Declaration (2001), which entailed a minimum investment target of 15% by all countries in the
74 African Union (23). Under the MoH, the health system is decentralized across the state, county, payam, and
75 boma levels of administration for health care levels including teaching hospitals, state hospitals, county
76 hospitals, primary health care centers (PHCC), and primary health care units (PHCU) (**Figure 1**) (24). The
77 Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC) oversees all humanitarian and disaster relief for the country,
78 and functions as the local authority in the implementation of all interventions at the town, county, and state
79 levels (25). A summary of major health policies and plans is available in the supporting information section
80 (**S2 Table**).

81 Health financing in South Sudan is complex, as humanitarian and development assistance has been
82 injected into the health sector since 2011, and prior. This includes the parallel development health funds
83 currently in place by the Health Pooled Fund (HPF) and the World Bank, in addition to humanitarian
84 funding allocations. A timeline of these funds listed by source and designation is provided in the supporting
85 information section (**S3 Figure**). The coordination mechanism consists of various fora, including the
86 humanitarian cluster system by sector (e.g., health, nutrition), development coordination groups, and a
87 select few hybrid platforms.

88 The aims of this paper are to: 1) analyze how leadership and governance, financing, and
89 coordination influence and impact the operationalization of health interventions in the humanitarian-
90 development nexus (HDN; also called the nexus) in South Sudan; 2) assess and document the barriers and

91 challenges related to the three constructs and their intersection; and 3) analyze drivers and facilitators that
92 enable the feasibility of implementing health interventions in the HDN. This study is part of a broader
93 project on the HDN and reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health (RMNCAH)
94 interventions in fragile settings by the US Agency for International Development’s MOMENTUM
95 Integrated Health Resilience project (hereafter “MOMENTUM”) (26).

96

97 **Fig 1. Administrative Health Units of South Sudan**

98

99 **METHODS**

100 **Study Design and Setting**

101 We conducted a qualitative case study, drawing from document reviews and individual and group
102 key informant interviews (KIIs). South Sudan was identified as a country case based on MOMENTUM’s
103 operational presence as a development actor working in the nexus on RMNCAH programming along with
104 country office capacity. Research was conducted in Juba County of Central Equatoria state and Bor South
105 County of Jonglei state (**Figure 2**, adapted from OntheWorldMap.com) (27). Juba serves as both the capital
106 and diplomatic center of South Sudan and Bor Town is in Bor South County and is the capital of Jonglei
107 State (28,29). Bor has experienced violence before and after independence (30). The area around Bor is
108 primarily agricultural, producing grains and supporting livestock (28,31). Jonglei state is prone to heavy
109 rainfall and seasonal flooding each year and has experienced ongoing food insecurity since 2016 (32,33).

110

111 **Fig 2. Map of South Sudan and Neighboring Countries**

112

113 **Data Collection**

114 *Document Review*

115 A document review was carried out prior to the country visit to sensitize the research team to
116 existing policies, strategies, frameworks, assessments, and implementation plans for health/RMNCAH in
117 South Sudan at the national and sub-national levels. Online sources for the document search included South
118 Sudan's MoH portal, ReliefWeb, HumanitarianResponse.info, The World Bank, and UN agency sites.
119 Publications which included a focus on RMNCAH and the HDN were included in the review. Documents
120 that did not fall within the time-frame of 2011-2023 and did not include a RMNCAH-HDN focus were
121 excluded from the review. Given HDN-specific terminology was not always explicitly used in documents
122 retrieved, the review was guided by terms used in a previous HDN landscape analysis, including themes
123 around fragility, sustainability, development plans, recovery, resilience, flexible funding, coherence
124 between humanitarian and development assistance, transition, handover, localization, and quality (34). All
125 relevant content was extracted and organized in Microsoft Excel.

126 Documents were also obtained during the in-country visit from stakeholders. These included both
127 public and non-public documents. All documents and resources obtained before and during the country
128 visit were organized and used based on their relevance to the research question of this study. Criteria for
129 inclusion of any documents or resources included the following: 1) information was relevant and within the
130 scope of the research; 2) information provided useful background or context for the research team; and 3)
131 and documents/resources helped the research team supplement, substantiate, or triangulate information
132 provided during interviews. Peer-reviewed literature found through a concurrent scoping review on the
133 HDN and SRMNCAH interventions in fragile settings (including South Sudan) were reviewed for this
134 study. The scoping review protocol was registered in the Open Science Framework in October 2022
135 [Protocol DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/6BSE4>] (29).

136 ***Key Informant Interviews***

137 A KII guide was developed on RMNCAH and the HDN, drawing from the literature on interview
138 guides and the HDN conceptual framework (**S4 Figure** in supporting information) (35–37). The process
139 was iterative, as each section of the guide underwent extensive review during its development by the

140 research team, a select group of external subject matter experts, and MOMENTUM’s technical and country
141 counterparts. Interviews were conducted on-site in Juba and Bor. All interviews were conducted in English
142 by preference of interviewees, except one group KII conducted in the Dinka language, with on-site
143 translation. After obtaining oral consent, interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed in real-time using
144 the artificial intelligence transcription program Otter, followed by transcript review and validation support
145 from Empire Caption Solutions and TranscriptionWing for accuracy (38–40).

146 A purposeful sampling approach was undertaken to select individuals and organizations at the capital
147 and county levels (35). Criteria were developed to ensure a diverse set of interviewees, which included
148 individuals from humanitarian and development organizations operating in South Sudan who were involved
149 in health policymaking, planning, financing, and/or implementation. Target stakeholders who fit these
150 criteria included government/MoH, UN agencies, institutional donors, local and international non-
151 governmental organizations (L/INGOs), and private sector and facility-based service providers (35).
152 Stakeholders who met the criteria were selected then stratified by type and geographic region (Juba and
153 Bor). Subsequently, a snowball sampling approach was utilized to identify additional interview participants
154 and incorporate new perspectives (35). The research team used this flexible, iterative approach to ensure a
155 wide range of actors were interviewed to gain a comprehensive understanding of the operational landscape.
156 The planned target was interviews with a total of 20-26 participants or until saturation was reached where
157 there was no longer new information presented (35).

158 **Analysis**

159 Content analysis methods were used to analyze interview transcripts, which entailed coding transcripts
160 for specific themes, concepts, and terms (35,41). The software Dedoose was used for coding and analysis
161 (42). An analytical codebook was developed through a deductive process where codes were based on the
162 study aims, the conceptual framework, and the interview guide (34,43). The codebook was then refined
163 through an inductive approach following the initial coding phase of select transcripts, particularly those that
164 offered the most nuanced perspectives (36). The coding process remained iterative to ensure researchers

165 captured the subtleties across transcripts and allowed for a significant degree of flexibility, along with room
166 for novel insights.

167 Document review and primary qualitative research findings were analyzed separately at distinct phases
168 of the research. These findings were synthesized by organizing findings from both data sources into distinct
169 thematic areas that were to be included in the research. Data were also used to substantiate, or at times
170 contradict, information provided by key informants. Information from documents and key informants were
171 triangulated to provide a more complete understanding of the situation and to ensure credibility,
172 dependability, and areas of significance for research purposes (35).

173 **Ethics**

174 The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health determined this project “Not Human
175 Subjects Research” as defined by DHHS regulations 45 CFR 46.102 and, therefore, does not require
176 institutional review board oversight. All participants provided consent prior to interviews conducted.

177 **RESULTS**

178 A total of **41 KIIs** were conducted with **68 participants** between November 2022 and January
179 2023, including 28 individual and 13 group KIIs. A total of 38 KIIs were conducted in-country and three
180 via Zoom call due to scheduling conflicts (44). **Table 1** provides a summary of interviews conducted,
181 organized by geographic location, KII (individual/group), stakeholder type, and gender (M/F). Stakeholders
182 interviewed included MoH officials, institutional donors, UN agencies and cluster leads, L/INGOs, private
183 sector, and health providers/committees. MoH officials in Juba were unable to meet during the data
184 collection period despite multiple attempts by the research team. A total of **22 documents** were identified
185 in the pre-visit document review and **35 resources** were obtained during the in-country visit. The latter
186 included both public and private documents and online resources, including assessments, contingency
187 plans, strategies, health dashboards, and medical consumption data. Pre-visit documents and relevant
188 information are available in the supporting information section (**S5Table**).

189 **Table 1. Summary of Interviews Conducted in South Sudan**

Key Informant Interviews—Juba	Type	Total KIIs	Participants		
			Male	Female	Total
Donor Agency	Individual	4	4	0	4
Donor Agency	Group	3	3	7	10
UN Agency and/or Cluster	Individual	3	3	0	3
UN Agency and/or Cluster	Group	2	2	2	4
International NGO	Individual	3	3	0	3
International NGO	Group	2	7	4	11
National NGO	Individual	2	2	0	2
National NGO	Group	1	3	0	3
Private Sector	Individual	2	1	1	2
Private Sector	Group	2	3	1	4
	<i>Sub-totals</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>46</i>
Key Informant Interviews—Bor					
Government/Ministry	Individual	3	3	0	3
Health Provider	Individual	3	2	1	3
Health Provider	Group	1	2	1	3
International NGO	Individual	4	4	0	4
International NGO	Group	2	5	0	5
National NGO	Individual	3	3	0	3
Health Committee	Individual	1	1	0	1
	<i>Sub-totals</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>22</i>
	Total KIIs	41	Total Participants		68
	<i>Individual</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>51</i>
	<i>Group</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>Female</i>		<i>17</i>

190

191 **Two Overarching Themes in the Nexus**

192 ***Rigid Institutional Structures and the Silos Within Multi-Mandate Teams***

193 According to some interview participants, a major barrier to operationalizing the nexus in South
 194 Sudan was the rigid, institutional structures, namely in large, bilateral and multilateral agencies, including
 195 the UN, donors, and INGOs. This was particularly the case for dual- and multi-mandate organizations,
 196 meaning those that had a combined humanitarian, development, and/or peace mandate. Of those
 197 interviewed from these agencies, some respondents cited working within silos, despite the existence of an
 198 overarching organizational nexus strategy at the headquarter level for their respective agencies. For

199 example, in the case of dual-mandate agencies operating in South Sudan, humanitarian and development
200 teams (and units, at large) were separate and did not always have formal measures in place to coordinate
201 interventions among each other from a planning, implementation, or financing standpoint. Rather, informal
202 collaboration was said to be occurring among individuals from humanitarian and development arms, but
203 not necessarily at the broader institutional level. High-level engagement was cited as infeasible by some,
204 given the major differences between mandates, notably in terms of programming life cycles, reporting
205 requirements, and separate and earmarked sources of funding. These distinctions were perceived to limit
206 more systematic nexus efforts. In addition to structural barriers, interviewees highlighted challenges in
207 terms of a power dynamic between international and local actors, along with the commitment to
208 localization—the empowerment of local actors and communities from affected populations to “have the
209 resources and agency to address the challenges that impact them” (45). Commitments to break structural
210 silos and enhance commitments to localization were deemed unsustainable and personality-driven given
211 the high turnover of international staff in South Sudan, often resulting in transient leadership initiatives.

212 *A Blurred Line Between Humanitarian and Development Mandates*

213 According to interviewees, the protracted nature of fragility in South Sudan has blurred the lines
214 between humanitarian and development assistance. Specifically for health interventions, similarities were
215 highlighted in the types of programs implemented by humanitarian and development actors, with the only
216 distinction referenced in multiple interviews being the source of funding and period of coverage. Given the
217 substantial humanitarian needs cited across the population, both types of assistance entailed the provision
218 of basic and lifesaving health services. Respondents attributed the inability to cover basic services to the
219 significant development funding gaps that were occurring between 2022-2023 (see financing section). This
220 further distorted the mandates of humanitarian and development actors given the continued fragility in the
221 country. One development actor illustrates the expansion of their primary health care mandate to include
222 humanitarian response due to emergencies like COVID-19 and Ebola:

223 “They [donors] know what our capacity is and what we can or what we cannot do, because we’re
224 contracted, at the end of the day, to deliver primary health within this country. We are not here as
225 emergency [humanitarian] responders. We do in the event there is an emergency and there is in our area,
226 but for argument’s sake, Ebola, COVAX, etcetera, that landed on our plate...”—Development Actor (I13)

227 Interviewees cited the difficulty in implementing sustainable development health programs due to
228 the absence of peace in the country, by drawing from the notion that there simply could not be “*sustainable*
229 *development without peace and no peace without sustainable development*” as per the Sustainable
230 Development Goals (46). One interviewee highlighted the impact of health interventions on development
231 through investment in “peace dividends,” in other words, peace-promoting activities, including the
232 equitable provision of services across communities which may facilitate harmony and social cohesion in
233 the interim, given long-term, political solutions have not yet materialized in South Sudan.

234 **Three Fundamental Components of the Nexus: Leadership & Governance,** 235 **Financing, and Coordination**

236

237 **LEADERSHIP & GOVERNANCE**

238 *Leadership & Governance in the Health Sector—who’s in charge here?*

239 Engagement with the South Sudanese government by humanitarian and development actors is
240 complicated given the indirect consequences of targeted sanctions on the health sector, particularly with
241 the MoH. Nearly all interviewees identified this as a significant barrier that impacted humanitarian and
242 development actors differently due to their respective mandates. Among humanitarian actors interviewed,
243 there was a consensus that working directly with the government amidst sanctions could compromise their
244 commitment to the humanitarian principles, particularly independence, impartiality, and neutrality (47).
245 Although many development actors interviewed confirmed their commitment to these principles, their
246 engagement was less restricted given expectations to engage with the government for development

247 activities. Despite the desire of most actors, especially humanitarians, to uphold these principles, this lack
248 of direct engagement was criticized as an attempt to bypass government, as one development actor
249 illustrated:

250 *“We are also working in a context in which there is a history of exclusion. [...] So, you have a situation in*
251 *which IPs (implementing partners) are working in communities and the government don’t even have a clue*
252 *what’s going on [...] that pointed to a level of resentment and discontent on the part of state government*
253 *that IPs come in, bypass them and start talking to communities.”—Development Actor (I6)*

254 The government was considered to have limited ownership of the health sector, as humanitarian
255 and development health assistance was predominantly managed by international actors. This created a
256 parallel leadership structure, with the MoH’s role considered more symbolic by some interviewed due to
257 its pronounced reliance on international assistance. Consequently, there appeared to be greater autonomy
258 and decision-making by international actors relative to their MoH counterparts, which raised concerns
259 around the power dynamic among stakeholders. One respondent attributed this differential to the limited
260 capacity of the government, further exacerbating dependence on external actors and limiting the
261 sustainability of health services:

262 *“The missing part is government capacity because whatever you do, the endgame [is] to exit. That’s the*
263 *endgame, so the community, government will take over. Without active government, it is [impossible]—*
264 Dual-Mandate NGO (I7)

265 Sustainability concerns were heightened in light of the immense development funding changes in
266 2022-2023, with over 220 of 797 health facilities covered by the HPF closed across eight states, the majority
267 of which provided RMNCAH services (48). These closures were dramatic and sudden, and most
268 interviewees reported fears around the potential impact on health outcomes in the short- and long-term.
269 Despite agreement by the government to take over these facilities and transition plans in place for this to
270 occur, the donors interviewed confirmed that this did not occur, as the government did not cover these

271 facilities following handover. Since the research was conducted, a consolidated multi-donor trust fund was
272 announced to replace the two separate health development projects, as will be outlined later in this paper.
273 A number of barriers to this transition were identified, including limited annual investment by the
274 government in the country's health budget with donors continuing to subsidize a significant portion of
275 health services. Other factors mentioned included a lack of political will by the government to uphold
276 takeover commitments, and more broadly, global funding shortages due to concurrent crises such as those
277 in Ukraine and Afghanistan.

278 *A Decentralized Health System on Paper—a top-heavy one in practice*

279 National health policies reviewed in this study outline a decentralized health system under the
280 general oversight of the MoH, with decision-making authority and prioritization of health services
281 occurring at the sub-national level (state, county payam, boma) (19,49–53). While this was the case in
282 theory, multiple respondents voiced frustration that most decision-making occurred at the capital (Juba) or
283 headquarter (international) levels by government or international organizations, and did not always align
284 with health needs identified at state or county levels. This discrepancy was attributed to a variety of factors,
285 including concerns around the politicization of aid, nepotism, and cronyism by government officials. Other
286 respondents pointed to an internationally led, top-heavy response as the reason for the inability for
287 decentralization to successfully work, with donors, UN agencies, and INGOs at the helm, essentially
288 perpetuating this top-down approach. The concentration of decision-making power and oversight by so
289 many actors at the top of the hierarchy relative to the field level where services were being delivered raised
290 concerns around the efficiency and sustainability of health interventions. Interviewees at the state level
291 conveyed concerns with relying on subjective decision-making in determining which facilities to support.,
292 such as using personal relationships to drive these decisions rather than relying on objective criteria (e.g.,
293 population density levels, needs assessments, etc.). Respondents cited that such subjective criteria
294 perpetuated inequities in the health system across different states and continued to undermine sub-national
295 leadership. Both international humanitarian and development actors interviewed discussed the challenges

296 they faced in the absence of a fully functional MoH and health system, with one respondent stressing the
297 impact of such limitations on sustainable development:

298 *“That’s our responsibility being superimposed within a weak system and within a scenario where we are*
299 *simply providing basic services [...] So the healthcare system is not functioning as a system that can sustain*
300 *development in a meaningful way.”—UN Agency (I14)*

301 In these same discussions, the localization agenda was raised as a vital element for sustainability.
302 With the bulk of service delivery led by international stakeholders, actors at the local level, including
303 LNGOs and community groups, perceived themselves to be situated at the bottom of the hierarchies in
304 place. LNGOs interviewed described this dynamic and blamed the endless series of “capacity building”
305 initiatives imposed on them by international partners, with local actors not considered capacitated enough
306 to lead at a certain point, even at the local level. One respondent captures this frustration:

307 *“Generally, in South Sudan, there’s only one word they are talking about and that’s that national NGOs*
308 *doesn’t have ‘capacity.’ This has been for more than 25 years [...] Okay, but even international NGOs*
309 *have been here more than 30 years, so they’re even unable to build a capacity for the national. Because*
310 *one of their roles is to build the capacity of the national. You look at this period and up to now, you’re*
311 *saying this person, this organization has no capacity. Now whose mistake is here, right?”—I18, National*
312 *NGO*

313 In summary, various factors in South Sudan have led to international actors taking the lead in the
314 health sector and limited government leadership, and decision-making power. The lack of government
315 involvement and capacity along with limited political will and restricted to engagement (e.g., sanctions)
316 have created gaps in the sustainability of health services and limitations in the feasibility of transitions from
317 international actors to the government, as evidenced by facility closures following HPF handover in 2022-
318 2023. The sustainability of health programming in South Sudan has also been raised in close connection

319 with localization efforts to strengthen the capacity of local actors in order to take over the delivery of health
320 services, with hierarchies between international and local stakeholders hindering these efforts.

321 **FINANCING**

322 *Major Development Funding Drawdowns—perpetuating humanitarian needs*

323 The period of research coincided with significant changes in health development funding, including
324 the drawdown of HPF funding by donors and the inability of the government to fulfill their commitments
325 to takeover, resulting in the closure of 220 health facilities (as mentioned above), and the transfer of
326 coverage of one additional state from the HPF to the World Bank. The split of development programs
327 among states between the HPF and World Bank has created a discrepancy in health service provision.
328 Differences were suggested in terms of the comprehensiveness of health services offered and the quality of
329 services provided. While the reasons for this discrepancy were less clear, there was speculation among
330 some respondents that more secure financial resources from the World Bank enabled more comprehensive
331 services and enhanced quality relative to the HPF. In addition, the International Committee of the Red Cross
332 (historically considered a humanitarian actor) is one of the largest implementing partners of the World Bank
333 in South Sudan and operates outside of the traditional humanitarian coordination architecture given its
334 official observer status granted by the UN (54). Despite this, the operational environment for the three
335 World Bank-coverage areas in 2023 (Unity, Jonglei, and Upper Nile states) were also more volatile,
336 insecure, and conflict-affected relative to those under the HPF (55). Despite both of these funds being
337 classified as health development funds, the majority of services covered under each were almost identical
338 to those funded by humanitarian actors, and in turn, resembled humanitarian funding but over a longer-term
339 period given the basic, lifesaving nature of services and fragility of the health system.

340 The combined impact of shrinking development funds and increased humanitarian needs between
341 2022 and 2023 prompted more humanitarian actors to fill substantial gaps in the health system. An example
342 of this coverage includes the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund managed by the UN Office of Coordination
343 for Humanitarian Affairs, which is intended for short-term coverage of acute, lifesaving humanitarian needs

344 based on the Humanitarian Response Plan. In 2022, this Humanitarian Fund was brought into the fold to
345 support health interventions previously covered by development health donors. This turn of events has
346 somewhat forced humanitarian and development donors to coordinate efforts to determine how best to use
347 available resources efficiently (as will be discussed in the coordination section). One donor illustrates the
348 significant impact of funding drawdowns on transition planning between humanitarian and development
349 assistance and on the continuity of health services:

350 *“We were also trying to understand sort of transitions and phase out of certain [donors] so we've seen*
351 *multiple conversations we've heard people saying, ‘Oh, funding’s cut. That's it, we're done’ [...] So just in*
352 *terms of thinking how some of those services continue when a lot of service actors are phasing out, and*
353 *how donors are also thinking about this? [...] If it's at a facility level and also large scale. Honestly, it's a*
354 *nightmare.”—Donor (I21)*

355 ***Efforts to Integrate Flexible and Cross-Cutting Humanitarian and Development Funding—more***
356 ***predictability and clarity needed***

357 Both humanitarian and development assistance in South Sudan integrated some form of flexible
358 funding for rapid-onset emergencies, particularly recurrent flooding, food insecurity, and mass
359 displacements. Such flexible funding allowed for the adaptation of programming and scale-up in order to
360 meet the needs among affected communities to these common shocks and stresses. However, it was difficult
361 for development actors interviewed to respond to the numerous and diverse emergencies, as the instability
362 and unpredictability of these emergencies often required them to halt their operations given these events
363 extended beyond their development mandate. In these instances, some confirmed that they simply withdrew
364 as it was expected that humanitarian actors would take over service delivery in these regions given their
365 mandate and ability to rapidly mobilize resources, as one development NGO notes:

366 “We could say because when people were displaced, the other actors, the humanitarian actors, they were
367 able to access those places [...] Like I said, because of our [development] nature, we were not able to
368 adjust and apply for humanitarian funding for us to access those places.”—Development NGO (I5)

369 The ability of development actors to provide humanitarian assistance according to changes in the
370 context was described as a challenging and rocky process that was complicated, as the scale of integrated
371 funding for emergencies has differed depending on the source of funding. For example, in the case of the
372 World Bank and its existing health systems strengthening programs, two different forms of emergency
373 funding can be triggered including the Contingent Emergency Response Component and the Crisis
374 Response Window. The former was used to disburse USD 40 million in response to the COVID-19
375 pandemic, flooding, and Ebola in target locations, including Upper Nile and Jonglei States and the Pibor
376 and Ruweng Administrative Areas. In comparison, it was observed that the HPF Emergency Preparedness
377 & Response Fund annual envelope amounted to less than 1% (roughly 0.33%) of its entire funding envelope
378 for the year (USD 200,000 from a total of USD 60 million) for all seven states of coverage. Other
379 contingency funds were mobilized at the onset of emergencies according to humanitarian actors
380 interviewed, including the Rapid Response Fund and Emergency Rapid Response Mechanism, which
381 essentially allowed these actors to respond to a crisis within a crisis (56,57). Some, though not all,
382 respondents noted these humanitarian-sourced funds were triggered more expediently as they were
383 expressly earmarked for this purpose. However, there appeared to be less clarity on how well coordinated
384 these funds were in terms of ensuring efficiency and complementarity with existing health programs, while
385 preventing duplication and overlap amongst humanitarian actors themselves, as well as between
386 humanitarian and development actors.

387 **COORDINATION**

388 *A Fragmented Coordination Landscape—insufficient coordination between development and*
389 *humanitarian actors*

390 A large number of diverse humanitarian and development health organizations operate in South
391 Sudan. In the health sector, at least 111 health agencies (besides the MoH) were identified according to
392 mapping efforts for 2023, including 6 UN agencies, 11 donors, 57 national NGOs, 31 INGOs, and 2
393 agencies with observer status (i.e., ICRC and MSF) (58). While numerous coordination platforms existed
394 among the humanitarian actors and fewer, but equally important coordination mechanisms were in place
395 for the development players, there were limited platforms for humanitarian and development actors to
396 coordinate together. **Table 2** provides a list of these major coordination bodies. It is important to note that
397 the RH coordination forum was the only topic specific coordination mechanism examined in this paper, as
398 the parent study focused on RMNCAH. For this reason, other fora (outside of the Health Cluster) were not
399 explored, such as HIV/TB, disease surveillance, etc.

400 **Table 2. Key Coordination Fora in South Sudan**

Coordination Body	Type
Strategic Advisory Group	Development
Donor Working Group	Development
Donor Working Group	Humanitarian
Resilience Advisory Group	Humanitarian-Development
Reproductive Health Coordination Forum	Development
National Steering Committee	Development
Heads of Coordination/Heads of Mission (HoCs/HoMs)	Humanitarian
National & Sub-National Health Clusters	Humanitarian

401
402 Most respondents referenced some fragmentation between development and humanitarian actors,
403 with one major donor citing this as the “*name of the game here*” in South Sudan. Though there were distinct
404 and separate coordination fora for humanitarian and development actors, these were often attended by the
405 same individuals or organizations given many identified themselves as multi-mandate. The humanitarian
406 coordination mechanism has formally been in place primarily through national and sub-national clusters
407 given the explicit coordination mandate for humanitarian response. Much of this coordination has been
408 guided by the annual Humanitarian Response Plan, which includes concrete programmatic and financial
409 targets by geographic area. Despite this planning and forecasting of needs, there was speculation among

410 donors and implementing agencies interviewed that there was still some duplication in both humanitarian
411 and development assistance given the concentration of actors often operating in the same geographic areas.
412 In terms of coordination for development actors, this was less formalized with meetings occurring on a
413 more ad hoc basis.

414 Although the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework for South Sudan (2023-2025)
415 outlines development targets and financial resources needed, this document was not referenced as a guide
416 by any development actors interviewed in the same way the Humanitarian Response Plan was used as the
417 overarching framework for humanitarians. Furthermore, the coordination for development was not donor-
418 mandated, unlike humanitarian coordination, according to those interviewed from the development sector,
419 but rather encouraged, particularly at the community level. However, the intense competitive environment
420 of securing contracts by development actors was cited as a major barrier to effective coordination. Given
421 the recent development health cuts, there appeared to be more explicit efforts to coordinate between
422 development donors.

423 Due to changes in development funding and the enhanced role of humanitarian donors to address
424 these gaps, broader nexus coordination efforts were also organized in 2022 by bilateral donors, such as
425 Germany, in order to bring together humanitarian and development agencies. Although less formal, it
426 appeared these meetings were to be planned on a more regular basis. A more high-level HDN coordination
427 body was also in place, which brought together major international actors, though this body did not entail
428 any joint mapping efforts by humanitarian and development actors in terms of charting activities
429 implemented in each area of operation. Additionally, the UN Deputy Secretary General/Resident
430 Coordinator/ Humanitarian Coordinator had taken strides to bring together humanitarian, development, and
431 peace actors building on the existing Partnership for Peace, Resilience, and Recovery initiative, which was
432 revamped in 2022 (59). Although this relaunch was still in its infancy at the time of our interviews, both
433 humanitarian and development actors who referenced this initiative identified it as a potential facilitator of

434 enhanced cooperation between actors across the nexus. Among respondents, however, there was not a clear
435 picture on the extent of funding and political commitment for this effort.

436 *Health Coordination and Gaps in Data Sharing, Decision-Making, and Prioritization of Assistance*

437 Respondents cited flooding, COVID-19, and the potential Ebola outbreak, among others, as key
438 inflection points in the coordination of health services in South Sudan, challenging both humanitarian and
439 development actors' ability to coordinate more effectively, specifically in terms of preparedness, planning,
440 and implementation. Although numerous coordination health meetings took place at the national level, these
441 were cited as information-sharing in nature, rather than action-oriented or rooted in decision-making.
442 Coordination at the state and county levels was focused on health services (primarily technical in nature),
443 but there were concerns relayed around how much these platforms were taken into account when decisions
444 were made at the national level. There was also less clarity in how services were coordinated and prioritized
445 in areas that were deemed more stable relative to highly fragile regions that required more resources and
446 immediate attention. A small number of participants shared examples of how such fragility considerations
447 informed resilience programming, especially in areas primed for early recovery and longer-term
448 development assistance.

449 There were also major challenges in coordination at the state and county levels reported as it
450 pertained to data availability and sharing, with interviewees referencing delayed or incomplete reporting
451 due to the limited capacity, availability, and motivation of MoH staff. Reasons cited for this included MoH
452 staff not being paid sufficiently or regularly relative to health cadre employed by international actors. Other
453 challenges included limited internet connectivity and access barriers in remote field locations, particularly
454 during major displacements and flooding. A lack of infrastructure and accountability mechanisms and
455 reluctance by actors to share health information were also referenced, with one respondent from the private
456 sector attributing this to a fear of repercussion by the government:

457 “It’s nothing other than this reluctance of sharing information...[Reluctance] across the board, data-
458 sharing in general. There’s no malice behind it. It’s just there’s not this thought behind the importance of
459 transparency or visibility into what everyone is doing for fear of repercussions.” —I11, Private Sector

460 Together, these factors impacted the quality and comprehensiveness of data available and hindered
461 the ability to access timely health information among both humanitarian and development actors, thus
462 limiting effective coordination, decision-making, and prioritization of health needs. This phenomenon also
463 translated to limitations in joint reporting between both actors and their ability to gain a cohesive and
464 comprehensive picture of geographic presence by actor and respective health interventions implemented in
465 each region. One donor interviewed elaborated on this point:

466 “They’re [donors and implementing agencies] not overlaying and speaking to each other, we need a really
467 good information management unit to be able to take all these data sets and now start helping you to drill
468 it down to make it much more accessible [but] that’s real-time information that has to be updated quite
469 regularly.”—Donor (I21)

470 Numerous respondents indicated they were simply unaware of what other actors might be present
471 in a geographic area if it fell outside of their mandate, be it humanitarian or development, primarily due to
472 gaps in coordination among each other and delays in information-sharing. Although there is a Health
473 Service Functionality Dashboard for South Sudan available which presents information (originally obtained
474 from the District Health Information System 2), this was not updated in real-time (60).

475 ***Field Level Coordination: A more feasible engagement amidst barriers at the national level***

476 In contrast to the limited engagement with the MoH at the national level, humanitarian and
477 development actors at the sub-national level cited stronger coordination with the state and county MoH and
478 the RRC. Though the RRC oversees humanitarian and disaster management at the sub-national level, both
479 actors interviewed referenced coordination with this body and stressed that without coordination and
480 clearance of planned interventions with both the state/county MoH and RRC, actors were unable to operate

481 in a given geographic area. Despite compliance with such coordination protocols, there were still concerns
482 around duplication in terms of health interventions, often leading to an excess or shortage of health services
483 relative to population-based criteria for health services outlined by national health policies and global
484 standards. One donor describes the saturation of services in Bentiu camp for internally displaced persons:

485 *“So, if I look at the example of [Bentiu] IDP camp, you have MSF, who's supporting the main hospital,*
486 *Bentiu state hospital, supported by World Bank previously HPF. And then you have so many partners*
487 *funded by all of us donors, [we're] completely guilty of it [...] I think there are five PHCCs in [Bentiu]*
488 *Camp, which is serving a population of 110,000 to 150,000, depending on the movement, but normally 110.*
489 *[...] But if you look at the national guidelines [for South Sudan and in accordance with global WHO*
490 *criteria], it should be one PHCC for 50,000 people. So, then you're kind of going in and you're seeing*
491 *duplication”* I21—Key Informant, Donor Agency

492 Health committees in place within each community helped support coordination efforts for the
493 PHCCs and PHCUs, however, the extent of their influence on different actors was less clear given the
494 presence of different international actors who wielded more decision-making power. The need for both
495 humanitarian and development actors to maintain their footprint in a given geographic area was mentioned,
496 even at the risk of duplication or overlap.

497 **DISCUSSION**

498 This study demonstrates that there is not a clear distinction between humanitarian and development
499 assistance in such a complex operational environment as South Sudan where there is an absence of peace.
500 Consequently, there is a lack of clarity as to how the HDN can be operationalized, particularly in the more
501 fragile states within South Sudan that face recurrent shocks and stresses. Key barriers identified through
502 this research include how the nature of assistance by humanitarian and development actors was influenced
503 by dramatic funding drawdowns for development health assistance, in addition to significant increases in
504 humanitarian needs from 2022-2023, a lack of government capacity, and protracted internal conflict.

505 Consequently, for many years, development assistance has been more humanitarian in nature, only
506 implemented over a longer time period with funding from development donors; hence, our categorization
507 of this as longer-term humanitarian assistance. Furthermore, there remain major development gaps in the
508 health sector that have been exacerbated by recent funding drawdowns, which humanitarian funding has
509 not, and should not, be expected to cover.

510 Recent funding drawdowns, particularly to the HPF, are part of an overall downward trend
511 documented for development assistance to South Sudan over the past several years, and more broadly, on
512 a global scale in 2023 (61,62). These reductions prompted an examination of how the two largest
513 development health funds in South Sudan (HPF and World Bank) may be administered more cohesively
514 and equitably given the differences between the funds, as has been implemented in other contexts, such as
515 Afghanistan's SEHAT project in 2013 and its successor the Sehatmandi project of 2018. Funded by the
516 World Bank, SEHAT was also a shift from a split funding mechanism amongst multiple donors with divided
517 coverage across different geographic regions of the country (63,64). In a similar effort, a consolidation of
518 the two development funds in South Sudan would also facilitate transition to the government in the long-
519 term, in line with existing plans for development actors.

520 Following the period of our research, a consolidated multi-donor trust fund was in fact announced
521 from 2024 onwards in place of the two separate health development projects. It will be called the new
522 Health Sector Transformation Project, funded by the World Bank and delivered through UNICEF (65,66).
523 Although it is still too early to assess such a fund, its consolidation will likely enable more consistent and
524 streamlined health services across the country. Efforts to enhance uniform approaches demonstrate the
525 continued need for complementarity and coherence across and between humanitarian and development
526 health assistance in South Sudan to use all available resources more efficiently. There should also be explicit
527 and actionable transition plans between humanitarian and development interventions, particularly at the
528 level of each state, that includes transparency in the funds provided and the interventions that will be
529 implemented. Following the most recent and dire funding gaps, such concrete planning efforts are both

530 timely and necessary. We would further recommend that these funding and intervention plans, together
531 with how the transition from humanitarian to development will occur, be available on a website and
532 accessible to the public to ensure transparency and accountability, particularly at the sub-national levels
533 (both state and county) in South Sudan.

534 Engagement among the government as well as humanitarian and development actors in South Sudan
535 has been extremely limited to date, particularly at the national level. This lack of coordination has
536 contributed to limited decision-making power and leadership by the government. It is due to a number of
537 reasons, including sanctions, lack of government transparency, and limited government contribution to the
538 health sector budget despite promises to do so. While targeted sanctions may address legitimate concerns
539 around transparency and human rights violations in South Sudan, their indirect impact on the health sector
540 has created an environment where the government has been inadequately involved in most aspects of the
541 health planning and response, and in many instances, as our findings demonstrate, completely bypassed. A
542 similar phenomenon was documented by Jones et al. (2015) and Sami et al. (2020) in South Sudan (20,62).
543 In those instances, the bulk of humanitarian and development assistance bypassed the government and was
544 directly channeled to INGOs who provided the majority of health services in the country, though reasons
545 for this were not attributed to sanctions, but rather due to a lack of capacity by the government (i.e., MoH)
546 and according to Sami et al., “a lack of confidence of the international donor community in the peace
547 process” (20,62). Despite these restrictions, there have been some efforts underway to increase the
548 engagement of the government at the state and county levels, though this has proven to be challenging for
549 a variety of reasons including due to the centralization of the health system decision-making, despite
550 national health policies and plans outlining a decentralized structure.

551 Beyond enhancing complementarity, humanitarian and development actors should also strengthen
552 their engagement and decision-making processes with government counterparts, particularly health
553 technocrats at the sub-national level (state, county, boma). While such enhanced engagement is important
554 in all parts of the country, it may be particularly pertinent in specific geographic regions of the country that

555 are deemed more stable than others, as such areas may be more conducive to sustainable development. This
556 study also pointed to an overreliance on UN agencies and institutional donors (in addition to INGOs, as
557 mentioned above) that subsidize and/or implement the majority of health services; over 62% of services in
558 South Sudan were financed by humanitarian and development actors as of 2022 (22). Such financial
559 dependence has increased in the absence of sufficient investment in the national health budget by the
560 government, and limited adherence to its financial commitments, despite the availability of government
561 resources such as oil revenues (21,22). The limited government contributions in South Sudan to the health
562 sector are consistent with trends observed in other low-income countries where government prioritization
563 of health spending has been shown to decrease when a significant amount of external aid is received. This
564 suggests that external aid has replaced, rather than complemented, government spending according to the
565 World Health Organization (67). Ultimately, the discrepancies in implementation and funding by
566 government and international actors in South Sudan may impact the viability of the health sector.
567 Furthermore, this study suggests such reliance on external actors may continue to diminish the role of
568 government in humanitarian health response and in its transition to longer-term, sustainable development.

569 A number of other factors influenced the feasibility of operationalizing the nexus, including rigid,
570 structural silos between humanitarian and development agencies, especially multi-mandate agencies,
571 contributing to separate streams of governance, financing, planning, programming, reporting, and
572 coordination. The programming and financing aspects hold critical significance as humanitarian and
573 development assistance are each governed by different life cycles, making it cumbersome to align
574 interventions (both health and/or non-health) and find areas of complementarity. This alignment may be
575 somewhat feasible within the same agency, as has been implemented in other contexts to date. This includes
576 the European Union's interventions in Chad (68) and USAID programs in in Yemen (69,70) and the Sahel
577 (Burkina Faso, Niger) (68). But this form of integration between humanitarian and development assistance
578 is still extremely challenging across different agencies, and at-scale, given the entrenched, bureaucratic
579 structures that exist in such large institutions. Various bilateral and multilateral agencies have taken some

580 strides to develop global (or regional) nexus policies, strategies, or guidance materials (though nexus
581 terminology is not always explicitly used in these documents), including USAID (71,72), the European
582 Union (73), and the United Kingdom Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (74).

583 However, there remains a need to develop, institutionalize and disseminate practical and clear steps
584 to adopt a nexus approach for health interventions in countries receiving significant amounts of
585 humanitarian and development assistance, including South Sudan. These headquarters' strategies should
586 translate strategies into concrete standard operating procedures that guide how humanitarian and
587 development actors can work together at regional and country levels, including clear and measurable
588 process and outcome indicators. In South Sudan, this is essential for the largest international actors present
589 who fund (donors) and/or deliver health services (UN, INGOs). Coordination platforms in South Sudan
590 have also contributed to these silos (and to some redundancy in the numerous fora that exist) given the
591 majority at the national and sub-national levels are either humanitarian or development. There were some
592 exceptions where there were hybrid platforms (i.e., humanitarian-development or humanitarian-
593 development-peace) such as the informal HDN coordination body. Despite the existence of this body and
594 other ad hoc efforts, there were no joint mapping efforts by humanitarian and development actors in terms
595 of charting activities implemented in each area of operation, thus limiting a clear and holistic picture of
596 who was funding what and where for both forms of assistance. Although this was clear within the same
597 agency, this mapping was separately conducted on the humanitarian side, and to a lesser degree on the
598 development side for organizations operating in the same geographic region. Other high-level HDP
599 platforms, such as the Partnership for Peace Recovery and Resilience were still in their infancy during the
600 data collection period, so it is too premature to determine if such an initiative will garner enough political
601 will and buy-in to propel nexus efforts forward. Additionally, some criticism has emerged that this specific
602 initiative will further perpetuate a top-down approach, thus questioning if the localization agenda has been
603 prioritized since LNGOs (and communities) have not led this effort relative to donors, UN agencies, and
604 INGOs involved (75).

605 This research also found another coordination challenge regarding joint preparedness and planning
606 between humanitarian and development actors (including the government) that negatively impacted health
607 service delivery in the case of sudden emergencies. While both types of actors were able to activate
608 contingency funds in these instances, such funds appeared to be primarily reactive rather than proactive or
609 preventive in nature, despite the predictability of some shocks and stresses (e.g., seasonal, climate
610 emergencies). Our review and stock-taking of rapid financing mechanisms demonstrated that there is some
611 flexible funding available for both humanitarian and development actors to respond to emergencies,
612 however, these remain separate, potentially limiting the efficiency of funds available and ability to flexibly
613 transition between both forms of assistance. In the case of development actors (World Bank, HPF), cross-
614 cutting emergency assistance suggested some integrated (nexus) efforts, however, such funds were often
615 inadequate, as was the case with the HPF's annual contingency envelope (0.33%) relative to its entire
616 funding portfolio. While it was assumed by some development actors that emergency funds could be
617 activated via humanitarian actors, the recurrence and scale of these emergencies has made it more
618 challenging to meet the increased needs in a timely, sufficient manner amidst a dwindling funding backdrop.

619 Lessons may be applied from existing preparedness efforts in South Sudan for more predictable
620 emergencies like floods, which have entailed community preparedness measures implemented by the South
621 Sudan Red Cross and preparedness funding released by the UN Central Emergency Response Fund and
622 South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (76,77). While these contingency measures were not health specific, they
623 represented preparedness planning and resilience-building efforts for communities given the recurrence of
624 climate shocks that inevitably impact health outcomes. Preparedness measures may also prevent further
625 backsliding in health development gains, as had occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic, given the
626 prioritization of emergency response (including over RMNCAH services in South Sudan and other low-
627 income countries) may limit investment in health systems strengthening and resilience, both of which
628 enable health systems and communities to absorb shocks and stresses and prevent backslides in health
629 (20,78–82). While there remain many challenges in strengthening health systems in South Sudan due to

630 heightened and recurrent fragility, as was documented more recently by Jones et al., there remains a need
631 to invest in such activities to help achieve longer-term development goals (20). A systems approach should
632 still be undertaken across all states, regardless of fragility, given the growing body of evidence on the need
633 for health systems strengthening and resilience activities in fragile settings, as has been documented in
634 South Sudan and other contexts to date, including Bangladesh, Yemen, Somalia, and the Democratic
635 Republic of Congo (83–85). Finally, early recovery and longer-term development programming may be
636 more feasible in the more stable states and counties relative to other fragile parts of the country. These areas
637 may provide an opportunity to deliver more comprehensive services and pilot HDPN programming.

638 ***Strengths and Limitations***

639 This research had several strengths. The research fills a gap in the literature on the
640 operationalization of health interventions in the nexus in South Sudan. This is the first study to examine the
641 constructs of leadership and governance, financing, and coordination in depth as it pertains to the
642 humanitarian-development-peace nexus and health interventions in South Sudan. The research included a
643 wide range of perspectives from humanitarian and development practitioners in South Sudan, across
644 multiple levels (e.g., donors, UN agencies, NGOs, health authorities, and the private sector). A rigorous
645 methodology was used to develop the key informant interview guide, as the research team utilized the
646 expertise of different subject matter experts (on both RMNCAH and South Sudan) to review and guide the
647 process. Key findings were also reviewed by subject matter experts, including health experts from South
648 Sudan and others with extensive knowledge of different components of the research to ensure a soundness
649 and nuance of such findings (sanctions, coordination and governance structures, RMNCAH). The core
650 research team consisted of humanitarian practitioners, with support from a team of health experts in South
651 Sudan, in order to ensure a contextualized approach. The use of a case study to document findings of this
652 research may prove useful for practitioners working in South Sudan and other fragile settings, as there have
653 been limited examples documented in the literature to date.

654 The research also had some limitations. These include potential biases (selection, recall, and
655 implicit), with efforts to limit these through ongoing reflexivity by researchers (33,74–76). Given the
656 research team was composed of experienced humanitarian practitioners, there may have been familiarity
657 with some respondents interviewed. Since interviews often probed on sensitive topics, particularly those
658 political in nature (e.g., governance, financing, sanctions), interviewees may have self-censored responses
659 despite assurances of confidentiality. In addition, findings may have touched on topics beyond nexus and
660 RMNCAH (or health) interventions, given the breadth of the HDN. While researchers focused on the
661 specific topics in this paper, some respondents used examples beyond the research scope, often to illustrate
662 priorities outside of, or in addition to, health, given the complexity and fragility in South Sudan. MoH
663 officials in Juba were unable to meet the research team during the on-site visit and following, despite
664 multiple attempts by the research team. This limited the ability to document firsthand perspectives among
665 government stakeholders in Juba, forcing the researchers to rely on other insights from non-government
666 personnel at the capital/national level in South Sudan. The research was commissioned by a USAID-funded
667 RMNCAH program, so there may have been donor-specific considerations taken into account by the
668 research team, including any current/past restrictions within RMNCAH interventions as outlined by US
669 policies on foreign assistance for sexual and reproductive health. In addition to these limitations, access
670 constraints restricted travel for the research team beyond Juba and Bor County for financial, logistical, and
671 security reasons. While interviews conducted in Juba capital were intended to represent broader, country-
672 level findings, this does not guarantee or signify country-wide phenomena. In addition, findings of this
673 study are not nationally representative. Finally, this research did not include interviews with any direct
674 recipients of health services (e.g., patients, clients), as researchers focused on stakeholders from the
675 humanitarian and development sectors at this stage that were directly involved with the financing, design,
676 and delivery of health interventions. A future area of focus may incorporate such perspectives given the
677 importance of centering patients/clients in the design and delivery of services, and more broadly, in ensuring
678 accountability to affected populations.

679 CONCLUSION

680 Protracted fragility in South Sudan has made it challenging for humanitarian and development
681 actors, including the government, to operationalize the nexus for health interventions. This study provides
682 in-depth analysis and insight into the leadership and governance, financing, and coordination landscape in
683 South Sudan, which impacts and influences the implementation of health services. The complex political
684 and operational environment has contributed to significant barriers to a coordinated, complementary, and
685 coherent response by humanitarian and development health actors. Fractured engagement with the
686 government has contributed to symbolic leadership and limitations in adequately involving MoH
687 counterparts at the national level, and to a lesser extent, at sub-national levels. The shifting funding
688 landscape for both development and humanitarian health actors provides an impetus for both actors to work
689 together to use resources more efficiently. This will require greater investment and political will in existing
690 platforms like the HDPN coordination body, Partnership for Peace, Recovery, and Resilience, and other
691 more informal nexus discussions occurring in South Sudan. While the consolidation of funding has been
692 one approach to streamline health service delivery among development actors, there is an imperative to
693 integrate humanitarian and development funding and assistance beyond contingency funding mechanisms
694 that currently exist. Humanitarian assistance should also incorporate more development-oriented activities,
695 such as health systems strengthening and resilience efforts to ensure development gains are preserved and
696 the health system and communities are able to absorb recurrent shocks and stresses, particularly given
697 ongoing and heightened fragility in different parts of the country. Additionally, more sustainable
698 interventions should be planned and funded, particularly in the areas of South Sudan that are deemed more
699 stable and are primed for early recovery and more sustainable development activities. These areas may
700 provide an opportunity to deliver more comprehensive services and pilot HDPN programming.

701

702

703

704 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

705 We thank all individuals interviewed in South Sudan for this research who generously provided their
706 insights, knowledge, and expertise for the development of this case study. We thank the MOMENTUM and
707 IMA World Health teams in South Sudan for their support throughout this research, including Mounir Lado,
708 Lou Eluzai, Martha Awet, David Gai Deer, Aret Thony Aret, and Pitia Moses Lazarus; and Nancy Stroupe,
709 Meghan Gallagher, and Melinda Pavin in Washington, DC. We thank Gathari Ndirangu Gichuhi and
710 Abdelselam Daif for their technical review of the data collection tools for this research and Yusra Shawar
711 for her guidance during the data analysis phase. We thank Kemish Kenneth, Annette Hearn, Rachel
712 Marcus, and Mark Ferullo for their review of research findings. Last, but certainly not least, we sincerely
713 thank Shannon Doocy, Shannon Frattaroli, and Hannah Tappis from the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School
714 of Public Health for their guidance throughout this research and for their extensive review of the manuscript.

717 REFERENCES

- 718 1. World Bank Group. The World Bank in South Sudan [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar
719 19]. Available from: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/southsudan/overview>
- 720 2. United Nations Peacekeeping. United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS)
721 [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jul 20]. Available from: [https://unmiss.unmissions.org/about-](https://unmiss.unmissions.org/about-unmiss)
722 unmiss
- 723 3. Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI). The paradox of federalism and decentralisation in South
724 Sudan: An instrument and an obstacle for peace [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2023 Aug 28].
725 Available from: [https://www.cmi.no/publications/6974-the-paradox-of-federalism-and-](https://www.cmi.no/publications/6974-the-paradox-of-federalism-and-decentralisation-in-south-sudan)
726 decentralisation-in-south-sudan
- 727 4. Biden Jr. JR. Notice on the Continuation of the National Emergency with Respect to
728 South Sudan [Internet]. The White House; 2021. Available from:
729 [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/03/29/notice-on-the-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/03/29/notice-on-the-continuation-of-the-national-emergency-with-respect-to-south-sudan/)
730 continuation-of-the-national-emergency-with-respect-to-south-sudan/
- 731 5. United Nations Security Council. UN Documents for South Sudan: Sanctions Committee
732 Documents [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Sep 1]. Available from:
733 [https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un_documents_type/sanctions-committee-](https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un_documents_type/sanctions-committee-documents/page/1?ctype=South+Sudan&cbtype=south-sudan#038;cbtype=south-sudan)
734 documents/page/1?ctype=South+Sudan&cbtype=south-sudan#038;cbtype=south-sudan
- 735 6. Transparency International. Corruption Perceptions Index 2022 [Internet]. 2022 [cited
736 2023 Jun 8]. Available from: www.transparency.org/cpi/2022
- 737 7. United States Agency for International Development. Policy Guidance On Criteria For
738 Payment Of Salary Supplements For Host Government Employees [Internet]. 1988 [cited

- 739 2023 Aug 28]. Available from: [https://www.usaid.gov/document/policy-guidance-criteria-](https://www.usaid.gov/document/policy-guidance-criteria-payment-salary-supplements-host-government-employees)
740 [payment-salary-supplements-host-government-employees](https://www.usaid.gov/document/policy-guidance-criteria-payment-salary-supplements-host-government-employees)
- 741 8. The Fund for Peace. Fragile States Index [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2023 Nov 26]. Available
742 from: <https://fragilestatesindex.org/>
- 743 9. World Health Organization. 2022 Annual Report | WHO in South Sudan [Internet]. 2022
744 [cited 2024 Mar 19]. Available from: [https://www.afro.who.int/sites/default/files/2023-](https://www.afro.who.int/sites/default/files/2023-04/WHO%20South%20Sudan%20Annual%20Report%202022.pdf)
745 [04/WHO%20South%20Sudan%20Annual%20Report%202022.pdf](https://www.afro.who.int/sites/default/files/2023-04/WHO%20South%20Sudan%20Annual%20Report%202022.pdf)
- 746 10. Africa Center for Disease Control and Prevention. South Sudan's Mpox Readiness
747 Assessed Amid Raging Outbreak [Internet]. [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from:
748 [https://africacdc.org/news-item/south-sudans-mpox-readiness-assessed-amid-raging-](https://africacdc.org/news-item/south-sudans-mpox-readiness-assessed-amid-raging-outbreak/)
749 [outbreak/](https://africacdc.org/news-item/south-sudans-mpox-readiness-assessed-amid-raging-outbreak/)
- 750 11. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. South Sudan [Internet]. 2023 [cited
751 2023 Aug 28]. Available from: <https://www.unhcr.org/countries/south-sudan>
- 752 12. United Nations Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs. Humanitarian Response
753 Plan 2023: South Sudan [Internet]. 2022. Available from:
754 https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/hrp_2017_20181.pdf
- 755 13. United Nations Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs. Humanitarian Response
756 Plan 2022: South Sudan [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 19]. Available from:
757 [https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/south-sudan-humanitarian-response-plan-2022-](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/south-sudan-humanitarian-response-plan-2022-march-2022)
758 [march-2022](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/south-sudan-humanitarian-response-plan-2022-march-2022)
- 759 14. World Bank Group. World Bank Open Data [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Mar 18].
760 Available from: <https://data.worldbank.org/>

- 761 15. United Nations Children’s Fund. UNICEF Data: Monitoring the situation of children and
762 women [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Mar 18]. Available from: <https://data.unicef.org/>
- 763 16. United Nations Population Fund. World Population Dashboard: South Sudan [Internet].
764 2023 [cited 2024 Sep 10]. Available from: [https://www.unfpa.org/data/world-](https://www.unfpa.org/data/world-population/SS)
765 [population/SS](https://www.unfpa.org/data/world-population/SS)
- 766 17. United Nations Development Program. Human Development Index (HDI) [Internet]. 2024
767 [cited 2024 Mar 18]. Available from: [https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-](https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-index#/indicies/HDI)
768 [development-index#/indicies/HDI](https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-index#/indicies/HDI)
- 769 18. World Health Organization. World Health Statistics 2023 [Internet]. Vol. 27, The Milbank
770 Memorial Fund quarterly. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 18]. Available from:
771 <https://www.who.int/data/gho/publications/world-health-statistics>
- 772 19. Ministry of Health South Sudan. National Health Policy 2016-2026 [Internet]. 2016 [cited
773 2024 Sep 10]. Available from:
774 [https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_repositor](https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_repository/south_sudan/south_sudan_national_health_policy_2016_to_2025_2.pdf)
775 [y/south_sudan/south_sudan_national_health_policy_2016_to_2025_2.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_repository/south_sudan/south_sudan_national_health_policy_2016_to_2025_2.pdf)
- 776 20. Jones A, Howard N, Legido-Quigley H. Feasibility of health systems strengthening in
777 South Sudan: a qualitative study of international practitioner perspectives. *BMJ Open*
778 [Internet]. 2015 Dec 1 [cited 2023 Jun 8];5(12):e009296. Available from:
779 <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/12/e009296>
- 780 21. High Quality Technical Assistance for Results (HEART), Oxford Policy Management
781 Limited and Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine. Scoping Options for the Future of the
782 Health Sector in South Sudan. 2022 Jun.

- 783 22. Widdig H, Tromp N, Lutwama GW, Jacobs E. The political economy of priority-setting
784 for health in South Sudan: A case study of the Health Pooled Fund. *Int J Equity Health*
785 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Jun 7];21:68. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-022-01665-w)
786 022-01665-w
- 787 23. African Union. African Summit on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Other Related Infectious
788 Diseases: Abuja Declaration. Abuja, Nigeria; 2001.
- 789 24. Gilmartin C, Collins D, Driwale A. The Boma Health Initiative Costing and Investment
790 Case Analysis. Arlington, USA; 2019.
- 791 25. DevelopmentAid. South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Commission [Internet]. 2022
792 [cited 2023 Jul 29]. Available from:
793 [https://www.developmentaid.org/donors/view/411376/south-sudan-relief-and-](https://www.developmentaid.org/donors/view/411376/south-sudan-relief-and-rehabilitation-commission)
794 rehabilitation-commission
- 795 26. United States Agency for International Development, MOMENTUM. MOMENTUM
796 Integrated Health Resilience [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 24]. Available from:
797 <https://usaidmomentum.org/about/projects/integrated-health-resilience/>
- 798 27. OnTheWorldMap. South Sudan Map [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 May 13]. Available
799 from: https://ontheworldmap.com/south-sudan/#google_vignette
- 800 28. The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. Bor. In: *Encyclopedia Britannica* [Internet]. 2011
801 [cited 2024 Sep 11]. Available from: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Bor-South-Sudan>
- 802 29. The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. Juba. In: *Encyclopedia Britannica* [Internet].
803 2019 [cited 2024 Sep 11]. Available from: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Juba>

- 804 30. International Crisis Group. South Sudan: Jonglei-"We Have Always Been at War"
805 [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2023 Aug 28]. Available from:
806 <https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/54991c5e4.pdf>
- 807 31. ReliefWeb. South Sudan Displacement Crisis: Bor Town Port and Road Monitoring - Bor
808 South County, Jonglei State, South Sudan (February 2022) [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023
809 Aug 20]. Available from: [https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan-](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/south-sudan-displacement-crisis-bor-town-port-and-road-monitoring-bor-south-county-jonglei-state-south-sudan-february-2022)
810 [displacement-crisis-bor-town-port-and-road-monitoring-bor-south-county-jonglei-state-](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/south-sudan-displacement-crisis-bor-town-port-and-road-monitoring-bor-south-county-jonglei-state-south-sudan-february-2022)
811 [south-sudan-february-2022](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/south-sudan-displacement-crisis-bor-town-port-and-road-monitoring-bor-south-county-jonglei-state-south-sudan-february-2022)
- 812 32. Conflict Sensitivity Resource Facility South Sudan. Bor South [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023
813 Aug 20]. Available from: https://www.csrf-southsudan.org/county_profile/bor-south/
- 814 33. ReliefWeb. South Sudan: Floods 2021-2022 [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2023 Jul 20].
815 Available from: <https://reliefweb.int/disaster/fl-2021-000108-ssd>
- 816 34. Qaddour A, Hoaglund H, Spiegel P. Landscape Analysis: The Humanitarian-Development
817 Nexus: A Framework for MNCH/FP/RH [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 17]. Available
818 from: [https://usaidmomentum.org/resource/landscape-analysis-the-humanitarian-](https://usaidmomentum.org/resource/landscape-analysis-the-humanitarian-development-nexus-a-framework-for-mnch-fp-rh/)
819 [development-nexus-a-framework-for-mnch-fp-rh/](https://usaidmomentum.org/resource/landscape-analysis-the-humanitarian-development-nexus-a-framework-for-mnch-fp-rh/)
- 820 35. Creswell J. Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design [Internet]. 3rd ed. Sage Publications;
821 2013. Available from: [http://www.ceil-conicet.gov.ar/wp-](http://www.ceil-conicet.gov.ar/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/CRESWELLQualitative-Inquiry-and-Research-Design-Creswell.pdf)
822 [content/uploads/2018/04/CRESWELLQualitative-Inquiry-and-Research-Design-](http://www.ceil-conicet.gov.ar/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/CRESWELLQualitative-Inquiry-and-Research-Design-Creswell.pdf)
823 [Creswell.pdf](http://www.ceil-conicet.gov.ar/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/CRESWELLQualitative-Inquiry-and-Research-Design-Creswell.pdf)
- 824 36. Yin R. Case Study Research Design and Methods (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: 282
825 Pages; 2014.

- 826 37. World Health Organization. Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: a handbook
827 of indicators and their measurement strategies [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2023 Jul 21].
828 Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/258734>
- 829 38. Empire Caption Solutions. Empire Caption Solutions [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Jul 21].
830 Available from: <https://empirecaptions.com/>
- 831 39. TranscriptionWing. TranscriptionWing [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jul 21]. Available
832 from: <https://www.transcriptionwing.com/transcription-services/>
- 833 40. Liang S, Fu Y. Otter.ai [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2023 Jun 24]. Available from:
834 <https://otter.ai/>
- 835 41. Columbia Mailman School of Public Health. Content Analysis [Internet]. 2023 [cited
836 2023 Jun 19]. Available from:
837 [https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/research/population-health-methods/content-](https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/research/population-health-methods/content-analysis)
838 [analysis](https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/research/population-health-methods/content-analysis)
- 839 42. Dedoose [Internet]. Los Angeles: SocioCultural Research Consultants, LLC; 2023 [cited
840 2023 Jul 17]. Available from: <https://www.dedoose.com/>
- 841 43. Roberts K, Dowell A, Nie JB. Attempting rigour and replicability in thematic analysis of
842 qualitative research data; A case study of codebook development. BMC Med Res
843 Methodol [Internet]. 2019 Mar 28 [cited 2023 Jul 17];19(1):1–8. Available from:
844 <https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12874-019-0707-y>
- 845 44. Zoom [Internet]. Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Zoom Video Communications, Inc.;
846 2024 [cited 2024 Mar 15]. Available from: <https://zoom.us/>
- 847 45. NEAR Network for Empowered Aid and Response. Localisation Policy [Internet]. 2024
848 [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from: <https://www.near.ngo/localisation-policy>

- 849 46. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. The 17 Goals [Internet].
850 2024 [cited 2023 Dec 3]. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- 851 47. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). The Fundamental Principles of the
852 International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. Geneva; 2015.
- 853 48. Médecins Sans Frontières. Severe health consequences expected for people of South
854 Sudan as sudden funding cuts take effect [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 20]. Available from:
855 [https://www.doctorswithoutborders.ca/severe-health-consequences-expected-for-people-](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.ca/severe-health-consequences-expected-for-people-of-south-sudan-as-sudden-funding-cuts-take-effect/)
856 [of-south-sudan-as-sudden-funding-cuts-take-effect/](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.ca/severe-health-consequences-expected-for-people-of-south-sudan-as-sudden-funding-cuts-take-effect/)
- 857 49. Ministry of Health South Sudan. South Sudan Health Sector Development Plan 2012-2016
858 [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2023 Jul 20]. Available from:
859 <https://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/c/LEX-FAOC175444/>
- 860 50. Ministry of Health South Sudan. The Community Health System in South Sudan: “The
861 Boma Health Initiative” [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2024 Sep 20]. Available from:
862 <https://moh.gov.ss/index.php>
- 863 51. Ministry of Health South Sudan. Family Planning Policy [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2024 Sep
864 20]. Available from: <https://moh.gov.ss/index.php>
- 865 52. Ministry of Health South Sudan. Reproductive Health Policy [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2024
866 Sep 20]. Available from: <https://moh.gov.ss/index.php>
- 867 53. Ministry of Health South Sudan. Reproductive Health Strategic Plan (2013-2016). 2013;
868 Available from: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00JVB3.pdf
- 869 54. International Committee of the Red Cross. The ICRC is granted observer status at the
870 United Nations [Internet]. 1990 [cited 2024 Mar 13]. Available from:
871 <https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/resources/documents/article/other/57jnwh.htm>

- 872 55. The World Bank. Appraisal Project Information Document-Integrated Safeguards Data
873 Sheet | South Sudan Health Rapid Results Project AF - P156917 [Internet]. 2016 [cited
874 2024 Mar 15]. Available from:
875 [https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-](https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/577851468107633236/appraisal-project-information-document-integrated-safeguards-data-sheet-south-sudan-health-rapid-results-project-af-p156917)
876 [reports/documentdetail/577851468107633236/appraisal-project-information-document-](https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/577851468107633236/appraisal-project-information-document-integrated-safeguards-data-sheet-south-sudan-health-rapid-results-project-af-p156917)
877 [integrated-safeguards-data-sheet-south-sudan-health-rapid-results-project-af-p156917](https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/577851468107633236/appraisal-project-information-document-integrated-safeguards-data-sheet-south-sudan-health-rapid-results-project-af-p156917)
- 878 56. International Organization for Migration South Sudan. Rapid Response Fund [Internet].
879 2023 [cited 2023 Jul 17]. Available from: <https://southsudan.iom.int/rapid-response-fund>
- 880 57. REACH. Emergency Rapid Response Mechanism (ERRM) Consortium in South Sudan
881 (April-June 2022) [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 17]. Available from:
882 [https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/emergency-rapid-response-mechanism-errm-](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/emergency-rapid-response-mechanism-errm-consortium-south-sudan-april-june-2022)
883 [consortium-south-sudan-april-june-2022](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/emergency-rapid-response-mechanism-errm-consortium-south-sudan-april-june-2022)
- 884 58. South Sudan Health Sector Strategy.
- 885 59. Partnership for Peace R and RSS (PfPRR). Who We Are [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jul
886 29]. Available from: <http://southsudanpfpr.org/page/who-we-are>
- 887 60. World Health Organization. South Sudan Health Service Functionality Dashboard: May
888 2022. 2022.
- 889 61. Justino P, Saadevra-Lux L. United Nations University . 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 11].
890 Development Aid Cuts Will Hit Fragile Countries Hard, Could Fuel Violent Conflict.
891 Available from: [https://unu.edu/article/development-aid-cuts-will-hit-fragile-countries-](https://unu.edu/article/development-aid-cuts-will-hit-fragile-countries-hard-could-fuel-violent-conflict)
892 [hard-could-fuel-violent-conflict](https://unu.edu/article/development-aid-cuts-will-hit-fragile-countries-hard-could-fuel-violent-conflict)
- 893 62. Sami S, Mayai A, Sheehy G, Lightman N, Boerma T, Wild H, et al. Maternal and child
894 health service delivery in conflict-affected settings: A case study example from Upper

- 895 Nile and Unity states, South Sudan. *Confl Health* [Internet]. 2020 May 27 [cited 2023
896 May 24];14(1):1–12. Available from:
897 <https://conflictandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13031-020-00272-2>
- 898 63. The World Bank Group Afghanistan Resilience Trust Fund. System Enhancement for
899 Health Action in Transition (SEHAT) [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Aug 17]. Available
900 from: [https://www.wb-artf.org/what-we-do/investment-projects/closed/system-](https://www.wb-artf.org/what-we-do/investment-projects/closed/system-enhancement-health-action-transition)
901 [enhancement-health-action-transition](https://www.wb-artf.org/what-we-do/investment-projects/closed/system-enhancement-health-action-transition)
- 902 64. The World Bank. Delivering Strong and Sustained Health Gains in Afghanistan: The
903 Sehatmandi Project [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 Mar 16]. Available from:
904 [https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2020/10/23/delivering-strong-and-sustained-health-](https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2020/10/23/delivering-strong-and-sustained-health-gains-in-afghanistan-the-sehatmandi-project)
905 [gains-in-afghanistan-the-sehatmandi-project](https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2020/10/23/delivering-strong-and-sustained-health-gains-in-afghanistan-the-sehatmandi-project)
- 906 65. The World Bank. Health Sector Transformation Project [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar
907 16]. Available from:
908 <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099112423141522464/pdf/P181385044609>
909 [d05080a20bdb195ca941b.pdf](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099112423141522464/pdf/P181385044609)
- 910 66. World Bank Group. The World Bank South Sudan Health Sector Transformation Project
911 (HSTP) (P181385) [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 16]. Available from:
912 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=SS>
- 913 67. World Health Organization. Global Expenditures on Health: Public Spending on the Rise?
914 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2024 Mar 12]. Available from:
915 https://files.who.int/afahobckpcontainer/production/files/2_Global_expenditure_o
916 [n_health_Public_spending_on_the_rise.pdf](https://files.who.int/afahobckpcontainer/production/files/2_Global_expenditure_o)

- 917 68. United States Agency for International Development. Operational Strategy for Shock
918 Response for the RISE Portfolio [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Dec 3]. Available from:
919 [https://www.resiliencelinks.org/resources/tools-guidance/operational-strategy-shock-](https://www.resiliencelinks.org/resources/tools-guidance/operational-strategy-shock-responsive-rise-portfolio)
920 [responsive-rise-portfolio](https://www.resiliencelinks.org/resources/tools-guidance/operational-strategy-shock-responsive-rise-portfolio)
- 921 69. United States Agency for International Development, John Snow I. Yemen Systems,
922 Health, and Resiliency Project [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 3]. Available from:
923 <https://www.jsi.com/project/systems-health-and-resiliency-project-sharp/>
- 924 70. United States Agency for International Development. Yemen Programming Approach
925 2020-2022 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 3]. Available from: [https://2017-](https://2017-2020.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID_Yemen_Programming_Approach_2020-2022.pdf)
926 [2020.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID_Yemen_Programming_Approach_2](https://2017-2020.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID_Yemen_Programming_Approach_2020-2022.pdf)
927 [020-2022.pdf](https://2017-2020.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID_Yemen_Programming_Approach_2020-2022.pdf)
- 928 71. United States Department of State. Relief and Development Coherence [Internet]. 2024
929 [cited 2024 Aug 21]. Available from: [https://www.state.gov/other-policy-issues/relief-](https://www.state.gov/other-policy-issues/relief-and-development-coherence/)
930 [and-development-coherence/](https://www.state.gov/other-policy-issues/relief-and-development-coherence/)
- 931 72. Howell JJ, Sommers M, Ezzi O. Practitioners Toolkit: Humanitarian-Development
932 Coherence [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Aug 21]. Available from:
933 https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00ZHDK.pdf
- 934 73. European Commission. HDP Nexus: Challenges and Opportunities for its Implementation
935 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Aug 21]. Available from: [https://international-](https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-05/eu-hdp-nexus-study-final-report-nov-2022_en.pdf)
936 [partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-05/eu-hdp-nexus-study-final-report-nov-](https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-05/eu-hdp-nexus-study-final-report-nov-2022_en.pdf)
937 [2022_en.pdf](https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-05/eu-hdp-nexus-study-final-report-nov-2022_en.pdf)
- 938 74. Foreign C& DO. The UK government's strategy for international development [Internet].
939 2023 [cited 2024 Aug 21]. Available from:

- 940 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-governments-strategy-for-international->
941 [development/the-uk-governments-strategy-for-international-development#chapter-1-a-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-governments-strategy-for-international-development/the-uk-governments-strategy-for-international-development#chapter-1-a-)
942 [new-international-development-strategy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-governments-strategy-for-international-development/new-international-development-strategy)
- 943 75. Kemmerling B. Spotlight on Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus Implementation in
944 South Sudan [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Mar 12]. Available from:
945 https://www.bicc.de/Publikationen//Spotlight_on_HDP_in_South%20Sudan.pdf
- 946 76. Sudan Tribune. South Sudan Red Cross to provide aid to Jonglei flood victims [Internet].
947 2013 [cited 2023 Jul 18]. Available from: [https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan-](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan-republic/south-sudan-red-cross-provide-aid-jonglei-flood-victims)
948 [republic/south-sudan-red-cross-provide-aid-jonglei-flood-victims](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan-republic/south-sudan-red-cross-provide-aid-jonglei-flood-victims)
- 949 77. United Nations Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs. United Nations releases
950 US\$19 million to help people in South Sudan prepare for severe flooding [Internet].
951 United Nations; 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 8]. Available from: [https://reliefweb.int/report/south-](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/united-nations-releases-us19-million-help-people-south-sudan-prepare-severe)
952 [sudan/united-nations-releases-us19-million-help-people-south-sudan-prepare-severe](https://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/united-nations-releases-us19-million-help-people-south-sudan-prepare-severe)
- 953 78. Kieny MP, Bekedam H, Dovlo D, Fitzgerald J, Habicht J, Harrison G, et al. Strengthening
954 health systems for universal health coverage and sustainable development. Bull World
955 Health Organ [Internet]. 2017 Jul 7 [cited 2024 Mar 16];95(7):537. Available from:
956 [/pmc/articles/PMC5487973/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35487973/)
- 957 79. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. UN report finds COVID-19
958 is reversing decades of progress on poverty, healthcare and education [Internet]. 2020
959 [cited 2024 Mar 17]. Available from:
960 [https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/sustainable/sustainable-development-](https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/sustainable/sustainable-development-goals-report-2020.html)
961 [goals-report-2020.html](https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/sustainable/sustainable-development-goals-report-2020.html)

- 962 80. The World Bank. The Reversal Problem: Development Going Backwards [Internet]. 2022
963 [cited 2024 Mar 17]. Available from:
964 [https://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/reversal-problem-development-going-](https://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/reversal-problem-development-going-backwards)
965 backwards
- 966 81. Khetrupal S, Bhatia R. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on health system & Sustainable
967 Development Goal 3. Indian J Med Res [Internet]. 2020 May 1 [cited 2024 Mar
968 17];151(5):395. Available from: </pmc/articles/PMC7530436/>
- 969 82. Pitt C, Bath D, Binyaruka P, Borghi J, Martinez-Alvarez M. Falling aid for reproductive,
970 maternal, newborn and child health in the lead-up to the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Glob
971 Health [Internet]. 2021 Jun 9 [cited 2024 Apr 19];6(6):6089. Available from:
972 </pmc/articles/PMC8190982/>
- 973 83. Tran NT, Greer A, Kini B, Abdi H, Rajeh K, Cortier H, et al. Integrating sexual and
974 reproductive health into health system strengthening in humanitarian settings: a planning
975 workshop toolkit to transition from minimum to comprehensive services in the
976 Democratic Republic of Congo, Bangladesh, and Yemen. Confl Health [Internet].
977 2020;14:81. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13031-020-00326-5>
- 978 84. Truppa C, Yaacoub S, Valente M, Celentano G, Ragazzoni L, Saulnier D. Health systems
979 resilience in fragile and conflict-affected settings: a systematic scoping review. Confl
980 Health [Internet]. 2024 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Mar 13];18(1):1–18. Available from:
981 <https://conflictandhealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13031-023-00560-7>
- 982 85. Landry MD, Giebel C, Cryer TL. Health system strengthening in fragile and conflict-
983 affected states: a call to action. BMC Health Serv Res [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2024

984 Mar 13];21(1):1–4. Available from:

985 <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-021-06753-1>

986

987 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

- 988 ▪ **S1 Table. Demographic Indicators in South Sudan, Regional (Sub-Saharan Africa), and Global**
- 989 **Averages**
- 990 ▪ **S2 Table. Major Health Policies and Plans in South Sudan**
- 991 ▪ **S3 Figure. Timeline of Major Humanitarian and Development Funds in South Sudan**
- 992 ▪ **S4 Figure. Conceptual Framework**
- 993 ▪ **S5 Table. Documents Reviewed Prior to On-Site Data Collection**




Figure 1




Figure 2