PROGRAMME-BASED BUDGETING FOR HEALTH

HISTORY OF THE TRANSITION TO THE PROGRAMME BUDGET IN MEXICO

1970s
Initial shift toward program budgeting

2008–2012
Shift toward modern program budget, starting with social sectors and eventually all sectors

2012
Program budget structure standardized across government

2013
Introduction of logical framework model for performance indicators

2015
Major reengineering to reduce total programs from over 1500 to below 900, and health programs from 40 to 34.

KEY OUTPUTS

- Program structure partly rationalized over time
- Elaborate hierarchical performance framework modeled on the logical framework implemented to track progress from activities to final outcomes
- Rigorous process for introducing new programs created
- Regular evaluation of program structure and performance indicators by third party evaluators in place
- Improved transparency of program structure and indicator frameworks

REMAINING CHALLENGES

- Number of programs still large by global standards rather than a program/sub-program hierarchy that represents the relationship between activities effectively
- Program structure dominated by very large programs in terms of budget, making trade-offs with smaller programs difficult and leaving large parts of the budget opaque
- Some programs (e.g. Seguro Popular) actually finance other programs (e.g. vaccination), meaning program structure does not elucidate trade-offs clearly
- “Responsible units” in the indicator framework have limited authority to ensure that other units contribute to common goals
- Links between health budget programs and the health sector plan are tenuous due to the way these were aligned, with programs forced to adopt the plan goals as final goals in their indicator frameworks

TYPES OF BUDGET PROGRAMMES IN MEXICO’S HEALTH BUDGET IN 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Class</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subsidy programs with special regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Other subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Public Service Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Provision of Public Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Regulation and Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Investment Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Support to the budget process and institutional efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Support to government administration and good government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVING FORWARD

- Further consolidation of the program structure and the creation of sub-programs would make the program budget more transparent and clarify relationships between activities
- Programs should be organized consistently around objectives, reducing or eliminating the problem of confusing financing flows between programs
- There may be a need to refine the concept of “responsible units” to ensure that they are able to manage other units that are meant to contribute to common performance targets