Bridging the rehabilitation data gap in Uganda: learning through the implementation of the WHO Routine Health Information System - Rehabilitation module

Md Zabir Hasan[1,2], Gerald Okello[3], Wouter De Groote[4], Abraham Omaren[3], Tim Adair[5], Abdulgafoor M Bachani[1]

[1] Johns Hopkins International Injury Research Unit, Department of International Health, Health Systems Program, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

[2] BRAC James P. Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

[3] Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

[4] Rehabilitation Programme, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, Geneva, Switzerland

[5] Nossal Institute for Global Health, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Md Zabir Hasan

ORCID: 0000-0001-8730-0054

Address: 615 N Wolfe St, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA

Phone: +14434880597

Email: mhasan10@jhu.edu

ABSTRACT

Background: The Health Management Information System (HMIS) of Uganda has historically lacked comprehensive, standardized, high-quality data on rehabilitation and assistive technology (AT) services. This data deficiency has hindered evidence-based decision-making for efficient resource allocation and hindered the contribution of rehabilitation and AT services to public health, limiting their integration and prioritization into health policy and strategic planning frameworks.

Approach: To address this gap, the Ministry of Health (MoH) of Uganda, in partnership with the Learning, Acting, and Building for Rehabilitation in Health Systems (ReLAB-HS) Consortium and the World Health Organization (WHO), integrated the WHO Routine Health Information System (RHIS) - Rehabilitation module into the existing HMIS. The process was facilitated by strategic engagement with national-level stakeholders, comprehensive readiness assessments of facilities, consensus building among stakeholders around a standard set of indicators, the development and pre-testing of HMIS tools, the configuration of District Health Information Software 2 (DHIS2), capacity-building activities, and the systematic deployment of the module.

Result: Since adopting DHIS2 in 2011, Uganda has primarily used paper-based data collection at healthcare facilities. Rehabilitation services are mainly offered at public National and Regional Referral Hospitals, private hospitals, and clinics in urban and peri-urban settings. Rural and underserved areas face significant challenges because of limited infrastructure and a lack of human resources, which hinder the delivery of rehabilitation services, effective data capture, and evidence-informed decision-making. In September 2024, six core rehabilitation indicators were successfully integrated into the HMIS. New data collection instruments were developed and rigorously field-tested, including a standalone outpatient rehabilitation register and an integrated inpatient register. Targeted training initiatives enhanced the capacity of rehabilitation personnel and HMIS focal points, and ongoing technical support ensured sustained data quality improvements and process adherence.

Conclusion: The integration process revealed the indispensable roles of stakeholder engagement, contextualized training, and continuous technical assistance. Persistent challenges included infrastructure deficits, workforce shortages, and competing health system priorities. Nonetheless, the initiative will significantly improve data availability, establishing a foundational framework for enhanced rehabilitation service delivery and strategic planning.

INTRODUCTION

The global need for rehabilitation services is increasing because of the rising prevalence of noncommunicable diseases (NCDs), injuries, and aging populations (1). One in three people worldwide lives with a health condition that may require rehabilitation during the life-course, yet more than 50% of these needs in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) remain unmet (2). In Uganda, 7.5 million people needed rehabilitation services in 2021, with 26% of the population requiring at least one or more assistive products (AP) to help them function. Only 5% of Ugandans who need an assistive product, however, have access to it, while 21% of the population reported unmet needs for assistive technology, reflecting severe deficiencies in availability and affordability, disproportionately affecting women and rural communities (3). These figures underscore the need for a robust, integrated data system to comprehensively capture rehabilitation and assistive technology (AT) services.

These global trends indicate the need to expand rehabilitation and AT services, especially in LMICs (4). Investment in rehabilitation and AT enables individuals to achieve and maintain optimal functioning, improve their health outcomes, and enhance their participation in daily life (5). The WHO Rehabilitation 2030: Call for Action emphasizes the importance of strengthening Health Management Information Systems (HMIS) to ensure timely and quality data collection for rehabilitation services (6). This data is critical for defining rehabilitation targets, monitoring outcomes, supporting clinical decision-making, and informing quality management. Routine health facility reporting, integrated into national HMIS, provides essential insights into service availability, distribution, and performance, helping countries achieve Universal Health Coverage (UHC) (7).

Uganda's national HMIS has historically lacked standardized rehabilitation and AT services (8)indicators. This gap has obstructed the systematic documentation of rehabilitation requirements and service delivery, making it challenging for policymakers to prioritize rehabilitation, track service availability, distribute resources appropriately, and bridge care gaps. Compounding these challenges, reliance on paper-based data collection further exacerbates data completeness, timeliness, and quality issues. Health facilities face competing demands, limited infrastructure, workforce shortages, and inconsistent reporting practices, particularly in rural and district settings (9). In response, during the mid-term review of its HMIS, Uganda's Ministry of Health (MoH) undertook the opportunity to mainstream rehabilitation and AT data within the HMIS. With financial support from USAID, Learning, Acting, and Building for Rehabilitation in Health Systems (ReLAB-HS) Project, and WHO, the MoH collaboratively integrated the WHO's Routine Health Information System (RHIS) - Rehabilitation module into the national HMIS (Box 1) (10,11). This initiative aims to enhance data collection, improve the visibility of rehabilitation services,

and inform health policies and strategic resource allocation, enabling Uganda to better respond to increasing rehabilitation needs and ensure equitable, accessible, and quality care (12).

Box 1: A snapshot of Routine Health Information System (RHIS) for Rehabilitation[11]

WHAT IS A Routine Health Information System (RHIS)?

RHIS collects facility-level data from healthcare workers, offering timely insights into service performance and quality while advancing an integrated environment for program-specific and cross-cutting data use (13).

WHY IS THE STRENGTHENING OF RHIS FOR REHABILITATION NEEDED?

Strengthening rehabilitation in health systems requires timely, quality data from RHIS to assess sector capacity, performance, and inform decision-making on accessibility, availability, workforce, quality, and outcomes. This supports real-time planning and responsive measures to meet population needs.

WHAT IS WHO'S RHIS - REHABILITATION TOOLKIT?

The WHO RHIS – Rehabilitation toolkit provides a standardized framework for collecting and analyzing rehabilitation service data (10). It includes indicators grouped by facility type, a DHIS2-compatible digital package for reporting and quality assurance, and training resources for data analysts and entry staff. The toolkit supports monitoring national rehabilitation priorities, integrating services into health systems, and advancing UHC goals by guiding Member States in capturing facility-level data.

LOCAL SETTING

A Systematic Assessment of Rehabilitation Situation (STARS) conducted by MoH identified significant deficiencies in Uganda's HMIS regarding rehabilitation and AT data (14). Rehabilitation services in Uganda face substantial gaps in accessibility, workforce distribution, and data management. Services are primarily concentrated in public National and Regional Referral Hospitals (NRHs and RRHs) and private health facilities, while district hospitals and lower-tier facilities remain underserved. Of the 1,022 registered rehabilitation professionals—including physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and orthopedic technologists—only 198 are accredited and practicing in the public sector in 2022. The current market gap in rehabilitation services is increasingly filled by private providers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and faith-based organizations. Facilities such as Nakasero Hospital, Case Hospital, CoRSU Hospital, and Katalemwa Cheshire Home offer services, particularly in urban areas (14). However, this concentration in urban areas leaves rural regions significantly underserved, exacerbating

disparities in access to services. Infrastructure limitations, workforce shortages, and inadequate deployment to rural and primary care facilities further impede the provision of essential rehabilitation services, perpetuating unmet rehabilitation needs.

Analysis of the HMIS data showed that 17 physiotherapy, 14 occupational therapy, and seven speech and language therapy conditions were captured, demonstrating low utilization of rehabilitation services, with many quality concerns on the data characterized with double counting of the conditions. Data are collected on a monthly basis using paper-based systems, which makes it challenging to track individual patients and measure long-term outcomes effectively. The usefulness of this data is further diminished by poor quality and inconsistent reporting practices. Moreover, the current indicators fail to offer valuable insights into service utilization, patient outcomes, or specific quality measures, such as outreach activities and waiting times. The HMIS mid-term review underscored the urgency of integrating standardized indicators recommended by WHO into the HMIS. This integration is essential to improve data quality, inform policy decisions, and strengthen rehabilitation services.

APPROACH

Integrating the WHO RHIS - Rehabilitation module within Uganda's National HMIS, as part of the District Health Information Software 2 (DHIS2) platform, was executed through a structured, multi-step strategy to ensure effective adoption and long-term sustainability. The RHIS - Rehabilitation module comprises 15 indicators: eight core indicators applicable to all health facilities, one for primary care facilities, and six for facilities with dedicated rehabilitation wards (10). These indicators cover critical aspects of rehabilitation services, AP provision, and patient outcomes and were adapted to align with Uganda's health system requirements (Table 1) (15).

1 **Table 1: WHO Routine Health Information System - Rehabilitation module indicators**[10]

Name of the indicator	Numerator	Denominator	Indicator Type	Attributable to
All Facilities				
Rehabilitation personnel density	Number of rehabilitation personnel	Total population × 10,000	Rate (per 10,000 population)	**Assessment of Input** – availability of core resources needed for the provision of essential rehabilitation services, quality of service delivery through the skill set of human resources available in the facilities, distribution of workforce by populations of a catchment area, by level of health care, and by needs specific to a region (equity of workforce deployment), composition of workforce for levels of care and geographical region.
Rehabilitation uptake	Number of rehabilitation sessions provided	Total population × 10,000	Rate (per 10,000 population)	**Assessment of Output** – the demand of the population and the capacity of the program to respond (e.g., by health condition group, geography), the extent to which people can access and use rehabilitation services by occupational group (coverage of interventions), the workload of rehabilitation workers in terms of demand by occupational group.
Rehabilitation service utilization	Number of cases that receive rehabilitation services	Total population × 10,000	Rate (per 10,000 population)	**Assessment of Output** – accessibility and availability of services, gender- or age-based accessibility issues, indirect assessment of the quality of services, integration of rehabilitation into a health system (coverage of interventions for specific health condition groups), distribution of services, utilization rates of health condition groups in a selected region or for the same health condition group across regions.
Assistive products uptake	Number of assistive products provided	N/A	Number (assistive products provided)	**Assessment of Output** – measures rehabilitation accessibility. Where disaggregated for the six WHO Assistive Products List categories, this indicator provides information about the capacity to deliver for the different categories. When disaggregated by geographic region, informs about the capacity of the rehabilitation sector to procure and deliver all assistive product categories across the country. Also, inform age-based accessibility issues.
Outreach programs uptake	Number of rehabilitation sessions provided by outreach programs	N/A	Number (rehabilitation sessions provided by outreach programs)	**Assessment of Output** – measures the accessibility of rehabilitation service uses (such as gender- or age-based accessibility issues) to reduce the service barriers. It also reflects rehabilitation demands and the capacity of the health systems to respond. Disaggregation by geographic region can reveal issues by region (distribution of services), with low numbers of sessions provided by outreach programs commonly caused by the lack of availability of required staff and their transport.

Rehabilitation referral	Number of referrals × 100	Total number of new cases accessing the facility	Percentage	**Assessment of Efficiency** – assessment of the continuum of care and, therefore, the quality and effectiveness of care. This can be used as a proxy indication for effective referral practice at all levels of care, when measured by geographic region can help establish or improve referral systems for rehabilitation or for awareness raising and training purposes, at the tertiary level can measure effective referral for people with complex rehabilitation needs, at primary health care level can demonstrate continued rehabilitation for chronic conditions and follow up closer to the community. Assessment of referrals by type of service.
Rehabilitation waiting time	Total of waiting days for the first session	Total number of new cases	Average (waiting days)	**Assessment of Efficiency** – informs estimation of unmet needs and timely service delivery, analysis by occupational group for different levels of health care helps to identify the need for investments regarding the availability of the rehabilitation workforce at these different levels, while analysis by region can help in advocacy to obtain greater personnel, comparison by facility also can be useful for facility managers.
Waiting time for assistive product provision	Total of waiting days for assistive product provision	Total number of assistive products provided	Average (waiting days)	**Assessment of Efficiency** – assessment of the continuum of care; timeliness of service delivery. It can measure whether there are delays, which can indicate poor capacity for service delivery or problems with procurement processes, waiting times may differ by WHO Assistive Products List categories, can be used to assess interventions to reduce waiting times, can compare facilities of the same level of health care. It also assesses accessibility issues in terms of unmet needs for different APL categories and for different geographical regions.
Primary care facilities				
Essential package availability	Number of facilities offering an Essential Package for rehabilitation × 100	Total number of facilities	Percentage	**Assessment of Output** – measures the percentage of PHC facilities providing one or more essential recommended basic packages and provides information on the status of the implementation of this recommendation in countries. This contributes to the assessment of Universal Health Coverage. Can disaggregate by type of essential package: this informs availability of service types. Analysis by geographical region can inform equality of distribution.
Dedicated rehabilitation ward				
Rehabilitation bed density	Number of rehabilitation beds	Total population × 10,000	Rate (per 10,000 population)	**Assessment of Input** – availability of core resources needed for the provision of essential rehabilitation services, monitoring, planning, and coordination, i.e., distribution of rehabilitation beds across health facilities and across programs to meet the needs of target populations.

				Indirectly assesses the quality of the service delivery system. Informs readiness for changing rehabilitation needs, especially in disaster-prone countries.
Individualized care plan	Number of new inpatients receiving an individualized care plan × 100	Total number of new inpatients	Percentage	**Assessment of Output** – this is a measure of quality for dedicated inpatient rehabilitation services because an individualized care plan contributes to better rehabilitation outcomes for clients. Analysis over time of this indicator provides information on gains made towards implementation of the individualized care plan for all clients, which can be compared across hospitals and regions.
Length of stay	Number of days of inpatient stay (for discharged clients)	Number of discharges	Average (admission days)	**Assessment of Output** – This is a measure of quality for dedicated inpatient rehabilitation services because the length of a rehabilitation stay informs assessment of effectiveness and efficiency. Benchmarking for a length of stay is difficult, but the aim should be for a shorter length of stay while respecting the client's progress regarding the improvement of functioning. An assessment of the length of stay for a specific health condition over a period informs about the progress made toward improvement of the effectiveness of rehabilitation services for that particular health condition which may result from interventions. This indicator also informs rehabilitation service use for selected health conditions.
Functioning change	Difference between the clients' average functioning assessment score at admission and at discharge	N/A	Difference	**Assessment of Outcome** – measures the change in the ability to independently live and participate in society, which is the overall aim of rehabilitation, it can assess overall clinical outcomes of rehabilitation and inform policymakers about the results of rehabilitation, assessment by facility can be conducted for quality assurance purposes and also as evidence for the planning of quality improvement measures, provides insights into achievable rehabilitation goals for that particular health condition
Coverage for people with acute and complex needs	Number of first-time admissions for selected health conditions × 100	Estimated number of new cases for selected health conditions in the country	Percentage	**Assessment of Outcome** – Assesses good clinical practice whereby inpatient multi-disciplinary rehabilitation is prescribed in a dedicated rehabilitation ward for the effective rehabilitation of a group of health conditions with acute and complex rehabilitation needs. Provides evidence of access issues and/or perceptions of service quality (acceptability). The choice of the health condition to be measured needs to be based on national priorities and the availability of the denominator (estimated number of new cases in the country with a defined health

				condition), hence, this indicator can only be captured at (sub)national level. The denominator could be a national estimate from ICD coding or countries may make use of incidence rates for the region to calculate the country denominator. This indicator also indirectly assesses the quality of rehabilitation services and the effectiveness of rehabilitation referral practices.
Accessibility for people with acute and complex needs availability	Number of first-time admissions for a selected health condition	N/A	Number	**Assessment of Outcome** – Dedicated rehabilitation ward: Can be used where a denominator is unavailable for 'Coverage for people with acute and complex needs'. This indicator is mapped to show locations of the specialized facilities with dedicated rehabilitation wards, comparing their overall utilization data and rehabilitation bed density, which can also be assessed by specific health conditions and geographically (assessing equitable access across health conditions and regional capacity issues).

The process began with stakeholder consultations involving the MoH, WHO, and ReLAB-HS in October 2022 (Figure 1). These consultative meetings clarified project objectives, roles, and responsibilities, establishing a clear implementation roadmap aligned with Uganda's national health priorities and global standards. The discussions in this consultative phase emphasized the critical need for integrating comprehensive rehabilitation data into the national HMIS during the overall review process of the system while securing support from key government stakeholders and decision-makers. Next, a readiness assessment was conducted across 12 facilities, including two National Referral Hospitals and 10 Regional Referral Hospitals, in June 2023. The assessment evaluated infrastructure, human resources, and existing data practices through a WHO-structured checklist. Findings revealed significant gaps, such as inadequate computer access, unreliable internet connectivity, and a shortage of trained rehabilitation professionals, underscoring the need for targeted interventions, capacity building, and infrastructure improvements to prepare facilities for effective data collection.



Figure 1: Timeline of integrating the WHO Routine Health Information System - Rehabilitation module into Uganda's National Health Information System

In parallel, an indicator selection workshop was held with rehabilitation professionals, policymakers, and data managers in February 2023 to build consensus on appropriate indicators and necessary modifications for Uganda's context. Participants reviewed the WHO RHIS - Rehabilitation indicators (Table 1), discussing the utility, relevance, and feasibility of each indicator. The workshop's recommendations were submitted to the MoH, which finalized six indicators for adoption. Following this, with support from WHO and ReLAB-HS, the MoH developed a detailed definition guide to standardize data interpretation and reporting.

During November 2023, revised HMIS tools were developed and pilot-tested in 18 health facilities by representatives of MoH to improve data collection processes. Following this, the MoH's Health Information Division, with technical support from the Health Information Systems Programme (HISP), customized the DHIS2 online platform between December 2023 and February 2024, enabling digital reporting of rehabilitation data. A Training-of-Trainers (ToT)program and co-development of the training material with WHO guidance equipped MoH staff and ReLAB-HS technical advisors to conduct two-day orientations for facility-level rehabilitation professionals and data personnel in June 2024. Data collection began in August through September 2024, with ongoing technical support through WhatsApp groups and follow-up visits. The first quarterly data quality review was conducted in December 2024 to ensure adherence to protocols and improve data accuracy.

RELEVANT CHANGES

The integration of the RHIS - Rehabilitation module into Uganda's HMIS involved a comprehensive review process to align with national health priorities. During the indicator selection workshop, stakeholders agreed to include 13 of 15 WHO-proposed indicators. Next, they ranked them based on criteria such as usefulness for decision-making at all health system levels, facilitating comprehensive analysis across results chain domains, ease of standardization, relevance for regional and global reporting, availability of variables in facilities, and limited data collection burden. This helped the MoH to select and approve the final list of indicators rationally. Following the MoH HIS division's review, seven indicators were removed, leaving six core rehabilitation indicators for inclusion in the DHIS2 (Figure 2).



Figure 2: Indicator selection process and list of final rehabilitation indicators integrated into Uganda's DHIS2

A newly developed outpatient rehabilitation register (HMIS REH 002) was introduced to capture data related explicitly to outpatient services. This register includes the “Waiting time” indicator, which measures the average waiting time for rehabilitation and AT services. However, while this indicator is captured in the outpatient register, it will not be reported through DHIS2 and instead will be analyzed at the facility level. The data dictionary was updated to reflect this indicator's inclusion. Similarly, two indicators removed from the DHIS2 reporting system, “Functioning change” and “Individualized care plan,” will still be captured in the inpatient register (HMIS IPD 003). These indicators will be reported later once HMIS IPD 003 is entirely digitized. Information about these indicators is provided during training sessions to ensure health workers are prepared for future reporting requirements. Individual report forms were developed for both outpatient and inpatient services: the HMIS 105 outpatient monthly unit report and the HMIS 108 inpatient monthly unit report. These forms are used by the HMIS focal person at each health facility to enter data from the registers into the DHIS2.

The DHIS2 platform was modified by the MoH with technical support from the HISP team to accommodate the finalized indicators and support digital reporting. Data collection officially began in September 2024 across four National Referral Hospitals, 17 Regional Referral Hospitals, and three district hospitals. Although online data reporting via DHIS2 is set to commence in 2025, hard copies of collected data are being stored at each facility to facilitate retrospective entry into the system once the platform becomes fully operational.

LESSONS LEARNED

The integration of the RHIS - Rehabilitation module into Uganda’s DHIS2 platform uncovered several challenges and opportunities. This integration resulted in significant learning for implementing it within the national HMIS, which can inform future initiatives. Table 2 summarizes these findings across the five broad domains of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Science (CFIR) (16): innovation, outer setting, inner setting, individuals, and implementation process.

68 **Table 2: Implementation challenges and opportunities across CFIR Domains for integrating WHO Routine Health Information System -**
69 **Rehabilitation module within Uganda's DHIS2**

Implementation Domains	Challenges	Opportunities
Innovation *refers to the characteristics of the RHIS - Rehabilitation module itself, including its features, structure, and purpose, which aims to standardize data collection on rehabilitation services and assistive technology within the DHIS2 system.*	• Limited opportunity for integration of rehabilitation indicators in primary care settings due to rehabilitation services is not at the primary care facilities.	• The WHO RHIS - Rehabilitation module's standardized indicators enhanced data-driven decision-making and service monitoring. • Minimum adaptations to the RHIS - Rehabilitation module facilitated easier alignment with Uganda's health system. • Integration of rehabilitation data into digital platforms increased the visibility and importance of rehabilitation services. • The module's flexibility allowed future expansion to include more detailed indicators and service categories.
Outer Setting *encompasses the broader context influencing Uganda's HMIS, including national policies, socio-economic factors, donor influences, and international guidelines. It reflects how external pressures, the Ministry of Health, WHO, and partners shape rehabilitation data integration into DHIS2.*	• Competing priorities, such as TB and HIV, limited the space available for new rehabilitation indicators. • Policy barriers delayed the integration of rehabilitation data into broader health information systems. • Limited funding from the government for printing and distributing registers hindered sustainability. • Fragmentation of rehabilitation and assistive technology data systems across different sectors (e.g., humanitarian settings, healthcare financing)	• Leveraging the Ministry of Health's mid-term review of HMIS facilitated integration into national priorities. • Existing policies, like the Disability Act 2020, supported to build an enabling environment that ensures the inclusion of rehabilitation data into HMIS. • Cross-sector partnerships (MoH, MoG, NGOs) provided avenues to improve rehabilitation service delivery. • Increased advocacy for rehabilitation services elevated its status within national health policies.
Inner Setting *focuses on Uganda's rehabilitation service delivery system, including referral hospitals and district facilities. It examines infrastructure, organizational culture, workflows, workforce capacity, internet connectivity, and the new module's compatibility with existing DHIS2 indicators and processes.*	• The existing DHIS2 system lacked a dedicated set of rehabilitation indicators, limiting the capture of rehabilitation data. • Inconsistent reporting practices and data quality issues, such as missing data and outliers, were prevalent. • Lack of rehabilitation-specific services and providers at primary healthcare levels restricted data collection. • High patient loads disrupted training sessions and data collection processes in health facilities.	• On-site training enabled hands-on learning and allowed trainers to address real-world challenges. • Enthusiasm among rehabilitation professionals and data personnel ensured commitment to the new system. • Facility-level engagement fostered advocacy for rehabilitation services and improved local ownership. • Digital transformation offered opportunities for streamlining data collection and improving data timeliness.

	• Limited infrastructure, such as space, computers, and internet access, hindered effective training and data collection.	
Individuals *refers to those involved in implementation, including MoH officials, rehabilitation professionals, data managers, and healthcare workers. It considers their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and the role of champions, training, and capacity-building in adopting the RHIS - Rehabilitation Module.*	• Rehabilitation professionals faced confusion during the transition to the new indicator set due to a lack of communication from the MoH. • Staff shortages in facilities hindered consistent data collection and reporting. • Resistance to adopting new processes due to busy schedules and high patient workloads.	• Motivated staff (e.g., rehabilitation professionals, HMIS focal points, and facility in-charges) viewed the new indicators as solutions for performance measurement.
Implementation Process *covers activities and strategies for integrating the EHIS - Rehabilitation Module into DHIS2, including stakeholder engagement, readiness assessments, indicator selection, tool development, and training. It emphasizes planning, execution, continuous support, feedback, and monitoring for sustainable implementation.*	• Some indicators were removed during the Ministry of Health's review due to budget constraints and priorities. • Developing independent outpatient rehabilitation registers raised concerns about long-term funding and sustainability. • Sustained funding was needed for printing registers, which were dependent on donor support. • Decentralized training faced logistical issues due to limited space and high patient volumes in facilities. • Initial data quality reviews revealed variations in reporting practices and inconsistencies in data capture.	• Collaboration with the Ministry of Health and WHO facilitated smooth navigation through the integration process. • Development of a detailed definition guide standardized data interpretation and enhanced reporting consistency. • Role-playing and scenario-based training prepared trainers to address common challenges effectively. • Training at health facilities provided direct engagement with hospital management, fostering additional support. • Continuous technical support, such as quarterly data quality reviews, improved data accuracy and adherence. • Establishing a WhatsApp group enabled real-time support and knowledge-sharing among trained staff.

Conducting training sessions at health facilities instead of centralized locations proved both beneficial and challenging. On-site training allowed trainers to address real-world challenges, engage directly with hospital management, and provide hands-on learning experiences for more healthcare providers. This approach also facilitated advocacy for additional support from hospital administrators. However, limited space, high patient loads, and busy schedules at health facilities disrupted training sessions. Simultaneously, introducing the new rehabilitation register capture (paper-based) at the RRH and NRH with the digitalization of data capture at these facilities caused confusion and resistance among staff, highlighting the need for better coordination and more streamlined implementation.

A crucial insight was the importance of building robust relationships with the MoH and committed government allies. The MoH's leadership and management were instrumental in maintaining the integration momentum, resolving conflicts, and ensuring stakeholder buy-in. Their involvement highlighted the importance of aligning rehabilitation data integration with national health priorities and securing ongoing funding for data collection tools such as the outpatient rehabilitation register (HMIS REH 002). The adaptive problem-solving approach — such as establishing WhatsApp groups with the trainers, rehabilitation professionals, and HMIS focal points of the facilities for real-time support and conducting capacity-building sessions—helped mitigate data capture and data summarizing challenges at the health facility level. These experiences highlight the value of consistent leadership, proactive management, and flexible planning in overcoming resource constraints.

Lastly, the indicator selection process emphasized the need for early and continuous stakeholder involvement, involving both public, private, and non-profit sectors. Although the initial workshop included a wide range of participants, several indicators were later removed due to high-level decisions from the MoH, budget constraints, and competing priorities. This highlights the importance of engaging decision-makers throughout the process and ensuring open communication channels. Furthermore, sustaining data quality requires more than initial training; continuous technical support, periodic data reviews, and advancing local ownership are essential. The iterative refinement of data collection tools based on user feedback ensures that the systems remain practical and sustainable. Moving forward, transitioning to fully digital data collection systems, addressing workforce gaps, and ensuring rehabilitation services remain a national priority will be crucial for the long-term success of the integration process.

CONCLUSION

The integration of the WHO RHIS - Rehabilitation module into Uganda's National HMIS signifies a critical milestone in strengthening rehabilitation data collection and management. By incorporating

standardized indicators, enhancing digital reporting through DHIS2, and supporting capacity-building efforts, this activity lays a strong foundation for evidence-based decision-making for the rehabilitation sector. Despite challenges such as infrastructure limitations, workforce shortages, and competing health priorities, the collaborative approach between the MoH, WHO, and ReLAB-HS has demonstrated the importance of stakeholder engagement, contextualized training, and ongoing technical support. Lessons from this implementation highlight the need for sustained investment, continuous refinement of data systems, and stronger policy integration to ensure long-term success. Moving forward, expanding rehabilitation data collection to lower-tier facilities, enhancing digitalization, and addressing resource gaps will be critical. By strengthening rehabilitation information systems, Uganda is advancing its commitment to universal health coverage and ensuring equitable access to essential rehabilitation services for all.

REFERENCES

1. Ghaffar A, Bachani AM, Hyder AA, Cieza A, Bhangu A, Bussières A, et al. Role and promise of health policy and systems research in integrating rehabilitation into the health systems. Health Res Policy Syst. 2024 Oct 9;22:143.

2. Cieza A, Causey K, Kamenov K, Hanson SW, Chatterji S, Vos T. Global estimates of the need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet Lond Engl. 2021 Dec 19;396(10267):2006–17.

3. Ministry of Health, Uganda (MoH), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Learning, Acting, and Building for Rehabilitation in Health Systems (ReLAB-HS). Uganda rapid Assistive Technology Assessment [Internet]. Kampala, Uganda: MoH and ReLAB-HS; 2023 [cited 2025 Jan 6]. Available from: https://library.health.go.ug/sites/default/files/resources/Uganda%20rapid%20Assistive%20Technology%20Assessment%20Booklet%20V.3-2%20Final.pdf

4. Neill R, Shawar YR, Ashraf L, Das P, Champagne SN, Kautsar H, et al. Prioritizing rehabilitation in low- and middle-income country national health systems: a qualitative thematic synthesis and development of a policy framework. Int J Equity Health. 2023 May 17;22(1):91.

5. World Health Organization. Rehabilitation in health systems: guide for action [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019 [cited 2025 Jan 6]. Available from: https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/325607

6. World Health Organization. Rehabilitation 2030: meeting report, Geneva, Switzerland [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2023 Jul [cited 2025 Jan 6]. Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/376162/9789240087392-eng.pdf?sequence=1

7. World Health Organization. World Health Organization. 2025 [cited 2025 Jan 10]. WHO Toolkit for Routine Health Information Systems Data. Available from: https://www.who.int/data/data-collection-tools/health-service-data/toolkit-for-routine-health-information-system-data/modules

8. Learning, Acting, and Building for Rehabilitation in Health Systems (ReLAB-HS). Rehabilitation in Uganda: A Call to Action [Internet]. Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.; 2024 [cited 2025 Jan 6]. Available from: https://relabhs.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Policy-brief_policy-prioritization-Uganda-Final-1.pdf

9. Umezuruike C, Nwankwo W. Implementation Challenges Of Health Management Information Systems In Uganda: A Review. 2017;4(7).

10. World Health Organization. Routine health information systems – rehabilitation toolkit [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Jan 6]. Available from: https://www.who.int/tools/routine-health-information-systems---rehabilitation-toolkit

11. World Health Organization. Routine health information systems – rehabilitation toolkit – information sheet [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Feb 5]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/routine-health-information-systems--rehabilitation-toolkit--information-sheet

12. World Health Organization. Improving rehabilitation data in Uganda [Internet]. World Health Organization. 2024 [cited 2025 Jan 6]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/improving-rehabilitation-data-in-uganda

13. World Health Organization. World Health Organization. 2025 [cited 2025 Jan 10]. Toolkit for Routine Health Information Systems data. Available from: https://www.who.int/data/data-collection-tools/health-service-data/toolkit-for-routine-health-information-system-data/introduction

14. Ministry of Health, Uganda (MoH), World Health Organization, Learning, Acting, and Building for Rehabilitation in Health Systems (ReLAB-HS). Systematic Assessment of Rehabilitation Situation (STARS) in Uganda [Internet]. Kampala, Uganda: Ministry of Health, Uganda (MoH); 2023 [cited 2025 Jan 10]. Available from: https://library.health.go.ug/sites/default/files/resources/UGANDA%20STARS%20REPORT%202023.pdf

15. World Health Organization. Guidance on the Analysis and Use of Routine Health Information Systems: Rehabilitation Module [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2022. Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/354390/9789240050242-eng.pdf?sequence=1

16. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback. Implement Sci. 2022 Oct 29;17(1):75.

October 2022

Multi-stakeholder engagement to establish objectives and roles

February 2023

Development of country-specific indicators through indicator selection workshop.

February 2023

Readiness assessment across health facilities

April 2023

Final selection of country indicators approved by MoH

May 2023

Development of registers and tally sheets
Creation of a definition guide

May – August 2023

Development of SOPs and data dictionary

November 2023

Pilot testing of registers and tally sheets in selected health facilities

December 2023 – February 2024

Adaptation of DHIS2 digital package

June 2024

Training-of-Trainers (ToT) program for ReLAB-HS personnel for data capture and entry training

August – September 2024

Facility-level training for data capture and entry training

September 2024

Health facilities began capturing RHIS rehabilitation data

December 2024

First data quality reviews conducted, capturing lessons learned

2025

RHIS information officially integrated into and reported through the DHIS2 system.


WHO RHIS - Rehabilitation Module standard indicators
1 Rehabilitation personnel density
2 Rehabilitation uptake
3 Rehabilitation service utilization
4 Assistive products uptake
5 Outreach programs uptake
6 Rehabilitation referral
7 Rehabilitation wait time
8 Assistive products wait time
9 Essential package availability
10 Rehabilitation bed density
11 Individualized care plan
12 Length of stay
13 Functioning change
14 Coverage of acute and complex needs
15 Accessibility of acute and complex needs
Indicators selected and ranked in the indicator selection workshop
1 Rehabilitation personnel density
3 Rehabilitation service utilization
2 Rehabilitation uptake
4 Assistive products uptake
7 Rehabilitation wait time
5 Outreach programs uptake
6 Rehabilitation referral
8 Assistive products wait time
10 Rehabilitation bed density
14 Coverage of acute and complex needs
11 Individualized care plan
13 Functioning change
12 Length of stay
1 Rehabilitation personnel density
10 Rehabilitation bed density
Indicators reported to DHIS2 annually directly from the MoH
2 Rehabilitation uptake
3 Rehabilitation service utilization
4 Assistive products uptake
5 Outreach programs uptake
6 Rehabilitation referral
14 Coverage of acute and complex needs
Six indicators included in the DHIS2 reported monthly from the health facilities
7 Rehabilitation wait time
8 Assistive products wait time
11 Individualized care plan
13 Functioning change
Indicator captured in the facilities, but not reported in the DHIS2
Indicators for all facilities
Indicators for primary care facilities
Indicators for dedicated rehabilitation ward
Indicators not selected to be reported