

# Global Stakeholder Analysis for HSS Evaluation Collaborative<sup>1</sup>

July 2022



## Introduction

Health systems strengthening (HSS) is widely understood to be key to achieving universal health coverage and to ensuring robust responses to health emergencies. In recent decades, global health investors have put more attention and investment towards HSS, leading to accelerated efforts to evaluate HSS policies and programs initiated by those investments. Yet, a common definition and framework for how to evaluate HSS interventions remains elusive, hampering efforts to strengthen, coordinate and amplify HSS programs.

The Health Systems Strengthening Evaluation Collaborative (HSSEC) brings together key global and national stakeholders to suggest ways to strengthen the quality of evaluations of health systems strengthening (HSS) investments in LMICs and to improve coordination across stakeholders in this space.

## Key Objectives

In this technical brief, we show summarized findings from a stakeholder analysis which focuses on global health funders and implementers in HSS that sought to understand their perspectives on the type of evaluation evidence needed to improve the levels and targeting of HSS investments, and suggestions for improving the quality, uptake and coordination of HSS investments.

## Overarching Findings/Themes

***Lack of shared definitions of health systems and HSS hampers coordination of monitoring and evaluation within and across global health investors:*** Despite an increasing commitment to health systems and HSS, global health investors have struggled to arrive at a common understanding of HSS. Respondents noted the varied understandings of HSS across global health investors and global health initiatives organizations, such as the ambiguity between health systems support and HSS. The lack of shared definitions has resulted in three related challenges: 1) difficulties *within* organizations and across organizations to track and assess HSS investments; 2) inability to effectively compare investments *across* organizations; 3) debates regarding the quantity and targeting of HSS investment decisions in global health initiatives involving multiple investors.

***Global health stakeholders rely on – and demand – different types of evidence in HSS evaluations, and for different purposes:***

Funding for global health is finite, and investors need to balance multiple dimensions in their decision-making: impact of investment on health outcomes, time to impact (lives saved in the near-term v. the long-term), perceptions and priorities around the disease- or health-conditions targeted, and national interests on the part of bilateral donors.

Global health investors diverged considerably in the *type* of HSS evaluation evidence sought or desired, and in the *end purpose* for gathering that evidence. Some respondents sought evidence that

draws a “line of sight’ between HSS investments, outputs and outcomes, including impact on health status. Other investors want to understand the overall cost-effectiveness of HSS investments compared with disease-specific investments, as well as relative “cost-effectiveness” of HSS interventions (investments in health workforce compared with investments in supply chain systems). Finally, a few respondents stressed the need for context-specific evidence that examined major learnings and considered how to improve HSS investments (understanding the “how”).

Despite a number of global agreements that evaluating the **contribution** of investments to collective outcomes rather than **attributing** specific outcomes to specific investments is desirable, respondents noted that funders were still often interested in attribution.

***Respondents differed on the feasibility of methodological innovation to answer HSS evaluation questions sought:*** Some respondents – particularly those stakeholders looking for an understanding of impact of investments – took the perspective that current evidence regarding the impact of HSS investments on health outcomes was inadequate and methodological innovation was required. Other respondents noted that such methods were highly challenging, and some of the evidence wished for may not be possible to generate, given the complexity of health systems.

***The uptake of HSS evaluation evidence was complicated by problems with timeliness, interpretability and engagement of national-level users :*** A few respondents shared perceived challenges with interpreting evidence on HSS, likening some health systems work as akin to “art appreciation”. Others noted that HSS evaluation timelines did not match programming cycles, and said that more emphasis on real-time evidence would be useful to investors. Communicating HSS evidence was widely acknowledged as challenging given its complexity. In addition, some respondents believed that more translation and dissemination of HSS evaluation evidence was needed at the country-level, and that evaluations currently appear to be tailored to donor uptake, as opposed to national-level stakeholders.

***Barriers to a coordinated approach to HSS evaluations included misaligned values, incentives and architectures among global health donors, within donor organizations and between donors and national-level stakeholders:*** . Internal consensus *within* global health donors regarding health systems and HSS also stood as a barrier to coordinating evaluation efforts. Finally, evaluation questions were often driven by donors and not national-level stakeholders, creating further barriers to effective coordination across all stakeholders.



[Itad.com](http://Itad.com)

[@ItadLtd](https://twitter.com/ItadLtd)

Itad is a global organisation. Our strategy, monitoring, evaluation and learning services work to make international development more effective. We generate evidence on important issues – from malnutrition to migration – to support our partners to make informed decisions and improve lives.

---