

Governing Multi Sectorial Partnerships in Emergencies: The Case of the Uganda COVID-19 Task Force

Running ahead: Multi Sectorial Partnerships in Emergencies

Abstract

Cross sector collaboration, particularly the use of Multi Sectorial Partnerships, has recently developed as a crucial element of efforts to deliver and improve public service outcomes across developing countries. Yet for collaborations initiated to respond to emergencies, these have to cope with both a fluid problem and the context of operation. We utilize a literature grounded framework and draw on publically accessible data on the empirical case study of the National Covid19 Task Force (NTF) in Uganda to discern important considerations for effective governance of cross-sector initiatives in emergencies. Based on the analysis, we argue that a careful mix of considerations in the structures, processes and actors realms enable collaborative initiatives to remain effective in a continually evolving and wide scale response in emergency contexts. We specifically underscore the primacy of the adoption of whole-of-government approach, cascading of identical collaboration structures to lower levels of government, adoption of a unified communication strategy, participatory resource mobilization and active involvement of initiative's champions. We have reinforced the enduring relevance of cross sector initiatives for addressing wicked problems, foreshadowed ingredients for more agile partnerships, and mainstreamed the consideration of evolving context in the collaboration discourse.

Key words: Governance, Multi sectorial partnerships, Collaborations, Emergencies, Public Service Outcomes

1.0 Introduction

In the developed and developing world, a multi sectorial approach to pooling resources to address complex social problems through public and private sectors collaborative organization continues to take root (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011; J. M. Bryson, Ackermann, & Eden, 2016; Pinkse & Kolk, 2012; Vangen et al., 2015). In a number of national jurisdictions, this collaborative working in now institutionalized through outright legislation and policy guidance and it is operationalized a cross different levels of

governance and diverse policy areas (Onyoin & Bovis, 2020; Wilkins, Phillimore, & Gilchrist, 2017).

Under the current global public health complexities, particularly the spread of COVID-19 pandemic, cross sector collaborative initiatives have underlined emergency responses in different countries and are now more likely to play an ever more prominent role in organizing the delivery of public services (Baxter & Casady, 2020; Mitra, 2020; Vaslavsky, 2021). Indeed, previous health crises gave rise to a number of public-private collaborative initiatives, such as Ebola Private Sector Mobilization Group (EPSMG) (Vopni, 2020) and Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) (Ingstad Sandberg, Andresen, Gopinathan, & Hustad Hembre, 2020). There are also global health initiatives that collate governments, donors, civil society, foundations, vaccine industry for the development and distribution of vaccines and diagnostics as well as treatment such as the Vaccine Alliance (Gavi); The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (The Global Fund) among others (Blanken & Dewulf, 2010; Bockmann, 2020; Homkes, 2011; Oluwole, Kraemer, & Pink Ribbon Red, 2013; Ruckert & Labonté, 2014). At national levels, cross sectorial, multi organizational and inter-agency collaborative teams are now common place arrangements to organize and coordinate responses (Corpuz, 2021; Sachs, 2021).

Yet, the organizational realities created by the pandemic threatens the necessary context for governing such collaborative arrangement at both design and implementation phases. In particular, the evolving complexities in regard to the urgency and unpredictability of needed action (Lone & Ahmad, 2020; Watkins, 2020), the multiple actors involved along with their influences (Khanna, Cicinelli, Gilbert, Honavar, & Murthy, 2020), the unprecedented scale of needed interventions (Ciotti et al., 2020) among others make the

operational context less predictable for collaborating partners especially to define and agree on meaningful and enduring expectations. The risk to effectiveness of collaborative initiatives in such context suggests the need for more agile approach for leaders and managers involved in such collaborations in public, private and third sectors.

Accordingly, while several gaps in knowledge on governing collaborations have been identified and continue to be answered in diverse national contexts (J. M. Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2015; Goldstein & Mele, 2016; Onyoin & Bovis, 2021; Provan & Kenis, 2008), how these cross-sector collaborative initiatives for emergency responses are governed remains an outstanding gap in knowledge.

In this chapter, we make a contribution by investigating the nature and the execution of the governance of collaborative initiative in practice. In particular, we identify and report key insights along three routes of structure, process and actors drawn from review of extant research on two realms of governance; collaborative governance and governing collaborations. The latter is concerned with the governance of collaborative entities per se (Cohen & Boast, 2016; Hueskes, Verhoest, & Block, 2017; Johnston & Gudergan, 2007) and the former is governance through the establishment of inter-entity partnerships (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015).

The specific question that shapes our contribution here is: How is the governance of cross-sector collaborative initiatives adapted to suit the contexts of the emergency. Our perspective in approaching this question is informed by two theoretical lenses; management and governance of public-private sector collaborations (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; J. Donahue & Zeckhauser; J. D. Donahue & Zeckhauser, 2011; Page, Stone, Bryson, &

Crosby, 2015). We draw on an empirical case study of the Multi-sectoral Covid 19 National Task Force formed in Uganda to coordinate the national response to Covid 19 pandemic – a classic case of cooperative formations; prevalence in Uganda’s public policy response to emergencies. We aim to show the intricacies that are inherent in the governance of collaborations in ways that further both theory and practice.

As we elaborate later in the chapter, we argue that a careful mix of considerations in the structures, processes and actors realm enables collaborations to function in continually evolving and wide scale response contexts created by emergencies. Specifically, we demonstrate the primacy of key considerations including the adoption of whole-of-government approach, cascading of identical collaboration structures to lower levels of governance, adoption of a unified communication strategy, participatory resource mobilization and active involvement of initiative’s champions.

The remainder of the chapter proceeds as follows: First; we begin with a review of extant works. This is followed by a description of our research method. Premised on extant works and our case study, we proceed to present the governance of collaboration through structures, processes and actors while delineating key considerations relevant for public-sector leaders and managers in practice seeking to address the governance of collaborative initiatives in an agile context and we conclude.

2.0 A Framework Synopsis: Structures, Processes And Actors

A central trait of inter-organizational collaborative initiatives is that they are governed and managed devoid of the hierarchical control (Birner & Wittmer, 2006; J. M. Bryson et al., 2015; Provan & Kenis, 2008). In the broader public management discourse, the concepts of

governance and governing are applied and utilized diversely in reference to coordinating and directing both in independent and inter-dependent organizational arrangements ((Birner & Wittmer, 2006; Chung, 2009; Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015; Henderson & Smith-King, 2015; Klijn, 2008).

In what follows, we dwell on broader concept of governing collaborations and emphasise the three aspects of structures, processes and actors that are central in the governance of cross sectorial inter organizational collaborative initiative. These three constitute an analytical framework that anchors our delineation of important insights from empirical data on the governance of collaborative initiatives formed and operationalized within a peculiar context.

First off, it is important to underscore that the broader notion of ‘collaborative governance’ draws essentially from the domain of discourse that emphasizes new patterns and approaches to government and governing (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015). The notion particularly emphasizes that governance is undertaken through horizontal interrelationships as opposed to emphasis on the vertical linkages as practiced in extant bureaucracies. Consequently, this understanding of collaborative governance positions it as the opposite to layered and rigid organizational arrangement (Skelcher, 2010; Sørensen & Torfing, 2009). Essentially, the advent of the notion is recognized more as public policy response to the critique of welfare statism and neoliberalism inclined approaches, such as new public management, and therefore to some, a reflection of shifting ideological paradigm (Bradford, 2003; Heuer, 2011; Vurro, Dacin, & Perrini, 2010).

On the other hand, we utilize the concept of 'governing collaborations' to infer to the governance of collaborative initiatives generally. The notion fundamentally draws on discourse which places significant attention on aspects of governance, leadership and management of inter-organizational relationships with the central intention of achieving collaborative advantage - as opposed to competition (Ashraf, Ahmadsimab, & Pinkse, 2017; Heuer, 2011; Huxham & Vangen, 2000).

A cursory consideration of the literature within this domain, we discern the primacy of the structures, processes and actors. As (Vangen et al., 2015, p. 1246) states 'The governance of a collaborative entity entails the design and use of a structure and processes that enable actors to direct, coordinate and allocate resources for the collaboration as a whole and to account for its activities'. We briefly elaborate on these and utilize these aspects as the framework for identification of key considerations **as visualized in figure 1 below.**

Insert Figure 1 here

First, an important understanding of the collaborative initiatives structure can be better gained by identifying the partners concerned and their interaction and connection with the central aim of the collaboration (Birner & Wittmer, 2006; Vangen et al., 2015). John M Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006) note that structure is a central idea in the theory of organizations with basic tenets of goal orientation, clearly defined tasks and responsibilities, principles for operations and explicit distribution of power. These structural relationships are an important part of the governance of these collaborative initiatives.

Structural interconnections shape who has legitimate access to influence the collaboration's directions, approaches, its priorities and ultimately the collaborations outcomes (John M Bryson et al., 2006). In essence, the structure defines the organizations or individuals who can shape the collaboration agenda as well as who may take the critical decisions and hold resources, authority and legitimate power to act and be accountable for the resources and results of the collaborations undertakings (Birner & Wittmer, 2006; J. Bryson, Sancino, Benington, & Sorensen, 2017).

Second, collaborations governance is also set and actioned through a set of processes that include the ways of communicating, how responsibility is shared and taking decisions in the course of the collaboration (Boyer, 2016; Cohen & Boast, 2016; Henderson & Smith-King, 2015). Such processes of governing can present in many forms and are essential for many reasons such as being vehicles for gaining legitimacy to exercise power and take actions.

Third, collaborative initiatives are also set with the understanding that the specific actors, individual or composite, will direct, coordinate and allocate resources on behalf of all partners in the collaborations and also be accountable for all the collaboration's activities (Appuhami & Perera, 2016; Vangen et al., 2015; Waring, Currie, & Bishop, 2013). In the next section we explain our approach.

3.0 Research Approach

We conducted an intensive case study of an inter-agency collaborative initiative, The National Covid-19 Task Force (NTF), mandated with the Covid 19 response in Uganda. The collaboration was initiated in the wake of the Covid 19 pandemic as a way to streamline the

national response to curb and scale down the Covid 19 infection in the country. The collaboration sought to address discordant actions and establish order and clarity in designing and implementing the necessary courses of actions.

The NTF was constituted with a multisectoral representation drawing on different partners from public, private and nonprofit spheres contributing to the response. Specifically, it was constituted with representation from the Office of the Prime Minister, Health, Internal Affairs, Defense, Works and Transport, Trade and Industry, as well as information and communications technology sectors, Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), and the private sector. At the core of its working are two government agencies; the Ministry of Health and the Office of the Prime Minister of Uganda. While the former is responsible for strategy and policy, it coordinates with the latter on the strategic and operational direction of the response as well as undertaking critical functions such as planning, budgeting and partner coordination. The operational response by different partners is aligned under eleven different pillars as shown in table 1 below.

.

Insert Table 1 here

Our focus was on an in-depth analysis of the set-up of the collaboration from its initiation in March 2020; and we examined the period of its operation until September 2021. The case study provided the opportunity to collect data on the governance of this collaboration during a period when concerted effort was required from diverse stakeholders to engage in real time to mitigate any adverse impact of the pandemic on the country.

Documentation relating to the National Task Force was collected by reviewing publically accessible data. Data was collected from diverse sources including, the document repository in the Covid 19 response information hub, media reports, published speeches of the national addresses, and sponsored press statements. These documents and media articles were entered into NVivo 12 and coded using a thematic coding approach following the structures, processes and actors framework drawn from the literature review. Further inductive analysis within the conceptual framework was conducted to reveal specific subthemes representing important observations. Drawing on this analysis, the following section presents and discusses the key cross sector governance observations that emerged from the analysis. We then conclude the chapter by identifying essential implications relevant for governance of collaboration discourse and for individuals and composite actors involved with the conception, design and implementation of cross sector collaborative initiative in practice and in fluid contexts.

4.0 Key Considerations in Governing Collaborative Initiatives

Using the conceptualization of governance developed and elaborated earlier, we construe the governance of collaborative initiatives in terms of structures, processes and actors. Using this framework and drawing on the case study of the NTF, we identify and elaborate the key insights drawn from this collaborative initiative. These include, adoption of the whole-of-government approach in its design, cascading of the identical structure to lower levels, adopt a single and unified communication strategy, participatory resources mobilization, and designation and active participation of principal promoters at different levels as summarized in Table 2. These are elaborated under the conceptual themes below.

Insert Table 2 here

Governing Through Structures

The structure of collaboration can be understood by identifying the parties involved, their interconnectedness and association with the purpose of the collaboration. In this regard, the analysis of the data revealed three important considerations in the setup and intersection of NTF.

First, adoption of the whole-of-government approach to the constitution of the collaboration appeared to be of critical importance in the ongoing functioning of this National Covid 19 Task Force. The Task Force consists of professional scientists, representatives from various government agencies including Office of the Prime Minister, Ministries of Health, Education, Trade, Finance, Tourism, Transport, information, Public Service and joint security agencies. It is evident that the broad representation specifically facilitated the pooling of necessary resources to aid in response activities including in areas where there is limited presence of some of the relevant departments of government. In this particular context of the goal to respond to the spread of Covid 19, peculiar resources, not required in the past health related concerns, were needed. The inclusion of security agencies within the structure, for instance, helped in the enforcement of curfews and mandated guidelines especially where policing by consent failed.

Moreover, the inter-agency setup of the National Taskforce facilitated the on time mitigation of unintended outcomes arising from enforcement of identified and approved measures. For instance, when the lock down was implemented, it became clear that certain sections of society would require basic supplies such as food. Accordingly, the different departments of government led by the Office of the Prime needed to make provisions with the budget for supplies to the most in need categories of people during the lockdown.

Ultimately the adoption of whole-of-government structural approach to the setup of the National Task Force was a prospect for building a strong and reciprocally supporting system, which drew on the core competencies of each participating party creating cross-sector synergy for the delivery of outcomes. Indeed, the effectiveness of the whole-of-government approach to addressing complex challenges and as a mitigation against sector specific failures is well-established in both literature and practice (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007; Halligan, Buick, & O'Flynn, 2011; Lee, 2020; Patrick & Brown, 2007). In line with the current context, Lee (2020), for instance, showcases how a coordinated whole-of-government approach was able to respond rapidly and progressively to the a fast evolving situation at the time.

Secondly, cascading of the identical structure to lower levels of government and institutions was important to reach all level of the population with both a coherent message and enforcement of agreed measures. The Presidential Directives on COVID-19 recognized the Local Governments as being essential and thus enabling lower government structures to operate besides medical and security agencies albeit with thin structures. The District Task Forces were then established. Below the district task forces also existed the Sub- County Task Forces (STF), Parish Task Forces (PTF) and Village Task Force (VTF) with similar tasks within the scope.

The District Taskforces (DTFs) sphere headed the implementation of Government of Uganda (GoU) COVID-19 containment interventions in local governments. Specifically, the DTFs were tasked with case identification and management, creating health awareness,

resource mobilization and enforcement of control measures as well as ensuring continued delivery of basic services.

The cascaded structure created a sense of responsibility and localized ownership of the intervention efforts across the country. More importantly, cascading of responsibility from National Task Force to Village Task Force appeared to offer protection against rent-seeking behavior of some actors.

Indeed, the use of cascaded structured to generate wider ownerships of interventions crafted at the highest levels of government is well established in collaboration discourse (Homkes, 2011) and in the multi-level governance discourse broadly (Allain-Dupré, 2020; Ciasullo, Troisi, Grimaldi, & Leone, 2020; Liu, Guo, Zhong, & Gui, 2021; Zürn, 2020). In particular, cascaded structures through multi-level governance has been noted to enhance credible commitment and shift responsibility (Ciasullo et al., 2020). It is posited widely as a credible strategy to remedy political transaction costs and which seems pertinent in developing countries, where public sector decision-makers take advantage of political institutions that are often devoid of checks and control mechanism (Ciasullo et al., 2020; Croese, Oloko, Simon, & Valencia, 2021). Similarly, it has been observed that notwithstanding partner's important and enduring differences, the use of multilevel mechanisms for coordination enables partners involved in renegotiating common understandings in the partnership (Henderson & Smith-King, 2015; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010).

Governing through Processes

The operationalization of processes constitute basic tenet in the governance of collaboration. The processes serve numerous reasons including being means through which parties acquire and exercise their influence. The governing processes can take varied arrangements and are commonly designed in modalities of communicating, sharing responsibilities and decision making. For instance our work specifically establishes the primacy of two processes in the case study of the National Taskforce in Uganda.

In the first instance, the decision to adopt a single and unified communication strategy to the citizenry appears to have played an important role in coordinating the activities and aligning the focus of all actors involved. The channeling of the national wide communication through the presidency appeared important in channeling information and also drawing national attention to the work of the National Taskforce and specific messaging of necessary actions required from the broader citizenry. In particular, the nationwide synchronized presidential addresses by the president basing on the information and advice of the national task force appeared to generate greater reach as media outlets were all mandated to air presidential addresses to the nation.

As Briggs 2007, p. 17 similarly observed “Working more successfully across organizations relies on better information-sharing and requires structured approaches to the collection and sharing of information and data. On a practical level, this includes continuing the progress towards the adoption of common information policies, standards and identifying information management needs early in the planning process around wicked problems”. Indeed, this observation is a mirror reflection of the communication protocols adopted by the National Task Force – particularly as it established the Covid 19 Response Information Hub (Government of Uganda, 2020). The Hub collated data and information and acted as a

platform for disseminating important information including numerous guidelines developed and targeting different categories of stakeholders across the country.

Second, participatory resources mobilization appeared to facilitate critical engagement and buy in. The evidence points to the decision of the NTF to adopt an inclusive rather than a designated responsibility approach to resourcing the work of the NTF across. The approach facilitated and reinforced the feeling of having a genuine stake in the NTF as all partners were asked to contribute resources. In an important way, the contribution of resources by the multiple agencies reinforced the sense of responsibility and incentive to ensure that the NTF is accountable for both results and resources in the process of the implementation of its mandate.

More centrally in this regard, as the NTF pooled resources from the general public to support its work, the interest from the broader stakeholders provided the collaborative initiative with the needed public acceptance and legitimacy to design and implement decisions. This is consistent with observations in extant inter-organizational research in which the ability of pooling resources reinforces the effectiveness of the partnership generally (Chen, 2010; Heuer, 2011; Morner & Misgeld, 2014) and more specifically it helps in building trust (Hudson, Hardy, Henwood, & Wistow, 1999; Luna-Reyes, 2013) and in the development of social capital among collaborating partners (Chen, 2010).

Governing Through Actors

Collaborative initiatives are governed through the actors involved meeting a set of implied and explicit expectations. These expectations relate to resources coordination and

deployment for collaborative activities for which a specific actor is accountable. In line with principles of collaborative governance, the collaboration presented here was led by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) which oversaw the governance structure. Like most collaborative initiatives, this governance structure – through the sponsor and various committees – composed of individuals drawn from organizations in the collaboration. These individuals held non overlapping roles in the committees which collectively made decisions for the direction of the NTF.

Our analysis of the actors-based governance specifically underscored the value of the designation and active participation of principal promoters at different levels of the collaborative initiative. The existence of principal support from the highest level of political leadership in Uganda appeared to have strengthened the NTF in a number of ways. First, on many occasions, the President of the Republic of Uganda gave national addresses as part of NTF team and in his capacity as the overall head of the response in the country. By championing the action of the NTF through direct personal involvement in convening and addressing meetings, facilitated the establishment of the climate of cooperation, mutual influence, frequent communication and shared learning and trust within the NTF.

Similarly, the president was able to draw from the leadership experience at the national level and bringing into play experience for analyzing NTF's operational context and abilities to promptly evaluate the costs of future action and or inaction of the NTF. It is unlikely that with the technically inclined constitution of the NTF that scanning of the political responses to the actions and decision of the NTF would have been possible. The

role of champions in enabling the success of projects and collaborations is indeed long established in literature (Dorado & Vaz, 2003; O'Flynn, 2009; Wilkins, Phillimore, & Gilchrist, 2016). For instance, based on their analysis of The Local Government Financial Structure Review (LGFR) project that started in January 2000 in South Africa, Dorado and Vaz (2003) reinforced the observations that champions tend to generate trust which leads to creativity and also create an environment for effective allocation of resources for project success through unique attributes which they seem to possess. Moreover, others have underscored the importance of having champions as they utilize their persuasion skills to aid support for the project and employ a wide array of techniques including endorsing, reasoning, demonstrating passion, and direct resource mobilization from sponsors to advance support for initiatives (Dorado & Vaz, 2003; Hudson et al., 1999). In the national addresses to the nation, for instance, it was evident that the country's president applied all the techniques and political sensitivities to generate attention and focus to the work of the NTF – often going off script to draw on personal live experiences in the fight against the pandemic.

5.0 Conclusion, Lessons and Recommendations

This book chapter has explored the governance of cross-sector collaborative initiatives. It has specifically contributed in filling a gap in extant knowledge about how collaborative initiatives are governed in specific contexts of addressing complex public problems requiring emergency and large scale response. Drawing on extant literature it delineates a frame of reference that considers concepts of structures, processes and actors in order to identify important insights from an empirical case study on how such initiatives can be effectively managed. Delineated from extant literature, the structures, processes and actors

conceptualization is not entirely new and is applicable to different contexts, including in non-emergency and limited scope organizational settings outside the public sector realm.

The conceptualization of the governance of collaborative initiatives from structures, processes and actor's perspective enables to foreground how collaborative initiative's design and implementation decisions are shaped by inherently competing logics and dynamics that exist in practice (J. Bryson et al., 2017; Hahn & Pinkse, 2014; Smeets, 2017). As we have laid out in the preceding section, a careful mix of considerations within the structures, processes and actors' realm both in the design and implementation phases enable the NTF to operate effectively in a fluid and unprecedented context. We have drawn these considerations in a way that suggested their contribution to known ingredients of collaboration success including, gaining public legitimacy (Birner & Wittmer, 2006), achieving broader stakeholder engagement (Onyoin & Bovis, 2021), collaborative capacity (Löfström, 2010; Wilkins et al., 2017), and effective information sharing (Chen, 2010; Cuganesan, Hart, & Steele, 2017; Lönn & Uppström, 2016; Page et al., 2015).

In essence, based on the analysis, our overarching conclusion is that paying due attention to structural, procedural and actors considerations is essential in directing and coordinating the collaboration initiative and to account for the collaboration's activities in terms of results and resources in fluid and large scale problem contexts. The practical lessons and recommendations that we draw from the analysis and exemplifications presented in this chapter are that governance of multi stakeholder initiatives in uncertain contexts of wide scale proportion:

- Is highly information intensive and thus requires ongoing consideration of diverse set of information from multiple stakeholders
- Necessitates widely acceptable individual champions to generate legitimacy of the organisation and its actions.
- Requires multi-level coordinated organization structures that help to apportion responsibility down wards to the lower to the levels both administration.
- Demands a great deal of stakeholder support for those in charge to avoid risks of active stakeholder opposition and check any actor opportunism during the activity implementation.

Despite the value of these insights and lessons, it is important to consider these within the context of three important caveats. First, the evidence was drawn primarily from the review of publicly available data in formal sources. These may not highlight the actual undertones in the practical workings of the NTF. Second, documented information utilized only contains the reality at this point of operation. As the NTF continues to be an operational guide to the ongoing response to Covid 19 pandemic, it is not possible within the time scope of this discussion to confirm any long-term effectiveness of these insights. Third, these insights are drawn from Uganda experiences with information shaped by the country's unique political, social and economic context. It is therefore unrealistic to generalize these insights to other country jurisdictions – and particularly not to those countries with significantly different political and socio-economic circumstances.

Accordingly, it would be useful to conduct a terminal assessment of the NTF which will consider more complete information from a broad range of sources, including individual

actor interviews, to determine the key explanations for NTF success or failure. Secondly, it would be reinforcing to conduct a similar assessment in another country context where a collaborative initiative of a similar nature has been operationalized to support the country response to Covid-19 or any other fluid and large scale public problem in or outside the health sector. Thirdly, there is potential to now move beyond multistakeholder partnerships as tool to also question what these organizations and their character actually mean for different work values. Finally, it would be value adding to governance of collaboration body of knowledge to compare and contrast the approaches of collaborative initiatives across countries of dissimilar socio-political and economic circumstances.

References


- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). Inside the matrix: Integrating the paradigms of intergovernmental and network management. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 26(12), 1401-1422.
- Allain-Dupré, D. (2020). The multi-level governance imperative. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 22(4), 800-808.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
- Appuhami, R., & Perera, S. (2016). Management controls for minimising risk in public-private partnerships in a developing country: Evidence from Sri Lanka. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 12(3), 408-431.
- Ashraf, N., Ahmadsimab, A., & Pinkse, J. (2017). From animosity to affinity: The interplay of competing logics and interdependence in cross-sector partnerships. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(6), 793-822.
- Baxter, D., & Casady, C. B. (2020). Proactive and Strategic Healthcare Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Epoch. In: ResearchGate.
- Birner, R., & Wittmer, H. (2006). Better public sector governance through partnership with the private sector and civil society: the case of Guatemala's forest administration. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 72(4), 459-472. doi:10.1177/0020852306070077
- Blanken, A., & Dewulf, G. (2010). PPPs in health: static or dynamic? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 69, S35-S47.
- Bockmann, J. O. (2020). Public-Private Partnerships in Sub-Saharan Africa's Healthcare. *Reflections on Leadership and Institutions in Africa*, 189.
- Boyer, E. J. (2016). Identifying a Knowledge Management Approach for Public-Private Partnerships. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 40(1), 158-180. doi:10.1080/15309576.2016.1204928
- Bradford, N. (2003). Public-private partnership? Shifting paradigms of economic governance in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Political Science-Revue Canadienne De Science Politique*, 36(5), 1005-1033.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2011). Public-private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance. *Public Administration and Development*, 31(1), 2-14. doi:10.1002/pad.584
- Bryson, J., Sancino, A., Benington, J., & Sorensen, E. (2017). Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 19(5), 640-654. doi:10.1080/14719037.2016.1192164
- Bryson, J. M., Ackermann, F., & Eden, C. (2016). Discovering Collaborative Advantage: The Contributions of Goal Categories and Visual Strategy Mapping. *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 912-+. doi:10.1111/puar.12608
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of Cross-Sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 44-55.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and Implementing Cross-Sector Collaborations: Needed and Challenging. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 647-663. doi:10.1111/puar.12432
- Chen, B. (2010). Antecedents or Processes? Determinants of Perceived Effectiveness of Interorganizational Collaborations for Public Service Delivery. *International Public Management Journal*, 13(4), 381-407. doi:10.1080/10967494.2010.524836
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2007). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review*, 67(6), 1059-1066.
- Chung, D. (2009). Developing an analytical framework for analysing and assessing public-private partnerships: a hospital case study. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 19(2), 69-90.

- Ciasullo, M. V., Troisi, O., Grimaldi, M., & Leone, D. (2020). Multi-level governance for sustainable innovation in smart communities: an ecosystems approach. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 16(4), 1167-1195.
- Ciotti, M., Ciccozzi, M., Terrinoni, A., Jiang, W.-C., Wang, C.-B., & Bernardini, S. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic. *Critical reviews in clinical laboratory sciences*, 57(6), 365-388.
- Cohen, R., & Boast, T. (2016). Governance of Public-Private Partnerships and Infrastructure Delivery: Case of the Milan, Italy, Metro Line M4. *Transportation Research Record*(2597), 37-43. doi:10.3141/2597-05
- Corpuz, J. C. G. (2021). Multisectoral approach on COVID-19 vaccination: a proposed solution on vaccine hesitancy. *Journal of Public Health*, 43(2), e370-e371.
- Croese, S., Oloko, M., Simon, D., & Valencia, S. C. (2021). Bringing the global to the local: The challenges of multi-level governance for global policy implementation in Africa. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 1-13.
- Cuganesan, S., Hart, A., & Steele, C. (2017). Managing information sharing and stewardship for public-sector collaboration: a management control approach. *Public Management Review*, 19(6), 862-879. doi:10.1080/14719037.2016.1238102
- Donahue, J., & Zeckhauser, R. Collaborative governance: Private roles for public goals in turbulent times. 2011. In: Princeton University Press.
- Donahue, J. D., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2011). *Collaborative governance*: Princeton University Press.
- Dorado, S., & Vaz, P. (2003). Conveners as champions of collaboration in the public sector: A case from South Africa. *Public Administration and Development*, 23(2), 141-150. doi:10.1002/pad.270
- Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015). *Collaborative governance regimes*: Georgetown University Press.
- Goldstein, B. T., & Mele, C. (2016). Governance within public-private partnerships and the politics of urban development. *Space and Polity*, 20(2), 194-211.
- Government of Uganda. (2020). Covid 19 Response Info Hub. Retrieved from <https://covid19.gou.go.ug/index.html>
- Hahn, T., & Pinkse, J. (2014). Private Environmental Governance Through Cross-Sector Partnerships: Tensions Between Competition and Effectiveness. *Organization & Environment*, 27(2), 140-160. doi:10.1177/1086026614530996
- Halligan, J., Buick, F., & O'Flynn, J. (2011). Experiments with joined-up, horizontal and whole-of-government in Anglophone countries. In *International handbook on civil service systems*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Henderson, S. S., & Smith-King, E. J. (2015). Sectoral decision making: structures, processes and trust. *Management Decision*, 53(7), 1545-1559. doi:10.1108/md-04-2015-0128
- Heuer, M. (2011). Ecosystem Cross-Sector Collaboration: Conceptualizing an Adaptive Approach to Sustainability Governance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 20(4), 211-221. doi:10.1002/bse.673
- Homkes, R. (2011). *Analysing the role of Public-private partnerships in global governance: Institutional dynamics, variation and effects*. (Doctor of Philosophy,), The London School of Economics and Political Science,
- Hudson, B., Hardy, B., Henwood, M., & Wistow, G. (1999). In pursuit of inter-agency collaboration in the public sector: What is the contribution of theory and research? *Public Management and International Journal of Research and Theory*, 1(2), 235-260.
- Hueskes, M., Verhoest, K., & Block, T. (2017). Governing public-private partnerships for sustainability An analysis of procurement and governance practices of PPP infrastructure projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(6), 1184-1195. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.02.020

- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the shaping and implementation of collaboration agendas: How things happen in a (not quite) joined-up world. *Academy of management journal*, 43(6), 1159-1175.
- Ingstad Sandberg, K., Andresen, S., Gopinathan, U., & Hustad Hembre, B. S. (2020). The formation of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI): An empirical study. *Wellcome Open Research*, 5, 284.
- Johnston, J., & Gudergan, P. S. (2007). Governance of public–private partnerships: lessons learnt from an Australian case? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 73(4), 569–582.
- Khanna, R. C., Cicinelli, M. V., Gilbert, S. S., Honavar, S. G., & Murthy, G. V. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons learned and future directions. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*, 68(5), 703.
- Klijin, E.-H. (2008). Governance and Governance Networks in Europe. *Public Management Review*, 10(4), 505-525. doi:10.1080/14719030802263954
- Le Ber, M. J., & Branzei, O. (2010). Value frame fusion in cross sector interactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(1), 163-195.
- Lee, C. (2020). Responses of Singapore to COVID-19 Pandemic: The Whole-of-Government Approach. *Good Public Governance in a Global Pandemic*, 205.
- Liu, Z., Guo, J., Zhong, W., & Gui, T. (2021). Multi-Level governance, policy coordination and subnational responses to COVID-19: Comparing China and the US. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 23(2), 204-218.
- Löfström, M. (2010). Inter-organizational collaboration projects in the public sector: A balance between integration and demarcation. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 25(2), 136-155. doi:10.1002/hpm.1003
- Lone, S. A., & Ahmad, A. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic—an African perspective. *Emerging microbes & infections*, 9(1), 1300-1308.
- Lönn, C.-M., & Uppström, E. (2016). *Understanding Public Sector Collaboration Through Boundary Object Theory: A Case Study of an E-Government Initiative in Sweden*. Paper presented at the System Sciences (HICSS), 2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on.
- Luna-Reyes, L. F. (2013). Trust and collaboration in interorganizational information technology projects in the public sector. *Gestion y Politica Publica*, 22(SPEC.ISS.1), 173-211.
- Mitra, R. (2020). COVID-19 is killing education budgets: are educational public-private partnerships an answer? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*.
- Morner, M., & Misgeld, M. (2014) Governing public value: How to foster knowledge-intensive collaboration in the public sector. In: *Vol. 2. Studies in Public and Non-Profit Governance* (pp. 41-57): Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- O'Flynn, J. (2009). The Cult of Collaboration in Public Policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 68(1), 112-116. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2009.00616.x
- Oluwole, D., Kraemer, J., & Pink Ribbon Red, R. (2013). Innovative public-private partnership: a diagonal approach to combating women's cancers in Africa. *Bull World Health Organ*, 91(9), 691-696. doi:10.2471/BLT.12.109777
- Onyoin, M., & Bovis, C. (2020). Policy and institutional enablers of public–private partnerships in the electricity sector in Uganda: a multi-level and path dependence perspective. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*.
- Onyoin, M., & Bovis, C. H. (2021). Sustaining public–private partnerships for public service Provision Through democratically accountable practices. *Administration & Society*, 00953997211030516.
- Page, S. B., Stone, M. M., Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (2015). PUBLIC VALUE CREATION BY CROSS-SECTOR COLLABORATIONS: A FRAMEWORK AND CHALLENGES OF ASSESSMENT. *Public Administration*, 93(3), 715-732. doi:10.1111/padm.12161

- Patrick, S., & Brown, K. (2007). *Greater than the sum of its parts?: Assessing "whole of government" approaches to fragile states*: International Peace Academy New York.
- Pinkse, J., & Kolk, A. (2012). Addressing the Climate Change-Sustainable Development Nexus: The Role of Multistakeholder Partnerships. *Business & Society*, 51(1), 176-210. doi:10.1177/0007650311427426
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229-252.
- Ruckert, A., & Labonté, R. (2014). Public-private partnerships (ppps) in global health: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Third World Quarterly*, 35(9), 1598-1614. doi:10.1080/01436597.2014.970870
- Sachs, R. (2021). Encouraging Interagency Collaboration: Learning from COVID-19. *Journal of Law & Innovation (2021 Forthcoming)*, Washington University in St. Louis Legal Studies Research Paper(21-05), 03.
- Skelcher, C. (2010). Governing Partnerships. In G. A. Hodge, C. Greve, & A. E. Boardman (Eds.), *International Handbook on Public-Private Partnerships*. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Smeets, D. J. A. (2017). Collaborative Learning Processes in Social Impact Bonds: A Case Study from the Netherlands. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 67-87. doi:10.1080/19420676.2017.1299034
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 234-258.
- Vangen, S., Hayes, J. P., & Cornforth, C. (2015). Governing Cross-Sector, Inter-Organizational Collaborations. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1237-1260. doi:10.1080/14719037.2014.903658
- Vaslavsky, Y. I. (2021). *Public-private partnership in fighting the COVID-19 global economic lockdown*. Paper presented at the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science.
- Vopni, L. (2020). Collaboration in a Crisis: Cross-Sector Responses to the Ebola Pandemic. *Cambridge Centre for Social Innovation*.
- Vurro, C., Dacin, M. T., & Perrini, F. (2010). Institutional Antecedents of Partnering for Social Change: How Institutional Logics Shape Cross-Sector Social Partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 39-53. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-0778-0
- Waring, J., Currie, G., & Bishop, S. (2013). A Contingent Approach to the Organization and Management of Public-Private Partnerships: An Empirical Study of English Health Care. *Public Administration Review*, 73(2), 313-326. doi:10.1111/puar.12020
- Watkins, J. (2020). Preventing a covid-19 pandemic. In: British Medical Journal Publishing Group.
- Wilkins, P., Phillimore, J., & Gilchrist, D. (2016). Public Sector Collaboration: Are We Doing It Well and Could We Do It Better? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 75(3), 318-330. doi:10.1111/1467-8500.12183
- Wilkins, P., Phillimore, J., & Gilchrist, D. (2017). Collaboration by the public sector: findings by watchdogs in Australia and New Zealand. *Public Money & Management*, 37(3), 217-224. doi:10.1080/09540962.2017.1282249
- Zürn, M. (2020). Unravelling multi-level governance systems. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 22(4), 784-791.

Figure 1: Cross-sector Collaboration governance elements



Source: adapted from Vangen, Hayes, and Cornforth (2015)

Table 1: Covid 19 Response Partner activity Map

Response Pillars		Number of Response Partners
1	Surveillance pillar	34
2	Coordination pillar	53
3	Infection Prevention and Control pillar	50
4	Case Management pillar	34
5	WASH pillar	47
6	ICT and Innovation pillar	26
7	Mental Health pillar	32
8	Risk Communication pillar	61
8	Logistics pillar	54
10	Human Resources pillar	36
11	Laboratory pillar	01

Source: Government of Uganda (2020)

Table 2: Summary of key Findings and Outcomes suggestions

Conceptual elements	Key considerations from case data analysis	Suggested implications on NTF effectiveness
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adoption of the whole-of-government approach ○ Cascading of identical structure to lower levels of government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ creation a formidable, mutually reinforcing system ○ creation a sense of responsibility and localized ownership of the intervention efforts ○ offered protection against rent-seeking behavior of some actors ○ checks and balances against opportunism by public sector decision-makers ○ facilitated critical engagement and stakeholder buy in
Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adoption of a single and unified communication route ○ participatory resources mobilization 	
Actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ designation and active participation of principal promoters at different levels of the collaborative initiative 	

Source: Authors