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**CONTEXT**

Performance-based financing (PBF) is emerging as a new alternative to finance health systems in Africa. In Mali, a pilot project was conducted from February 2012 to December 2013 to improve demand and supply of health services through financing performance.

**Objectives:** To understand the project’s sustainability process and to assess its sustainability level.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Participants:** 49 stakeholders interviewed (administrators, health practitioners, conceptualisers)

**Sites:** 6 community health centres

**Documents:** 12 documents collected

**Analysis:** Themes analysis according an aggregated conceptual framework
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**RESULTS:** Weak routinisation of the 5 sustainability’s determinants

- **Organisational memory**
  - Organisational investments (materials, staff, supplies, real estates, etc.)
  - Investments depreciation (expertise loss, damaged materials, etc.)
  - Level of resources acquired in the project not sustained (end of the project)

- **Values/Codes**
  - Objectives correspondence (better quality of services & health centres reinvestments)
  - Focus on results & payments (dismissing the objectives and the project’s rituals on longer term)
  - Language gap (difficulty for stakeholders to have a common understanding of activities, especially managers and health workers)

- **Adaptation**
  - Project based on needs (activities addressing organisational, individual, local and national needs)
  - Structural compatibility (project using existing structures, activities and procedures for implementation)
  - Preponderance of the project over the facilities (dismissing centres specificities)

- **Development of stakeholders’ relationships**
  - Stakeholders gathering (municipalities, women & youth associations, religious leaders, etc.)
  - Increased communication during the project (reports, meetings, informal channels)
  - Results based relations (loss of different channels & disinvestment of some actors after deproject)

- **Rules/Procedures**
  - Tasks clarification (specialisation &/or reorganisation of duties)
  - Reinforced supervisions during the project (increased frequency, better supervision, planning support)
  - Few remaining procedures after the project (good reception, registration process)

**RESULTS:** Incomplete sustainability’s 5 phases process

- **Capacity evaluation**
  - Identification of missing resources (staff, material, training)
  - Previous cooperation between actors (Project SIEC, long term presence of the Dutch cooperation)
  - Lack of leadership for implementation (actors up in the hierarchy)
  - Loss of funding (USAID’s baseline study)
  - Local capacity evaluation not taken into account

- **Sustainability planning**
  - Experimental project (Project with a set ending)
  - Lack of correspondence between the pilot-project and the project to be scaled-up

- **Sustainability evaluation**
  - Focus on financial aspects
  - Disinterest of sustainability (rumours of a World bank financed scale up project)

- **Actions**
  - Few actions for sustainability because:
    - lack of appropriation
    - high staff & leaders turnover

- **Modifications**
  - No modification to sustain the project

**CONCLUSION**

Need for:

- Better planning of sustainability
- Improved comprehension of the concept

**Project sustainability level**

Null Precarious WEAK Medium High

**Weak Sustainability**

Most organisations’ activities come from the intervention but are not routinized according to the five determinants; on short term, activities are not guaranteed.