

Multilateral vs. Bilateral Approaches: Comparing the Role of International Organizations in HIV/AIDS Policy Development in East Africa

Nassimbwa Kabanda D.

Faculty of Medicine Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

HIV/AIDS remains a critical public health challenge in East Africa, necessitating robust policy responses and sustained international collaboration. This review compares the roles of multilateral and bilateral international organizations in shaping HIV/AIDS policy in East Africa, focusing on countries such as Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, and Rwanda. Multilateral institutions—like UNAIDS, WHO, and the Global Fund—emphasize coordinated, country-led strategies and regional alignment, while bilateral actors—such as PEPFAR (USA), DFID (UK), and GIZ (Germany) often reflect donor-country interests and direct aid models. The review examines the effectiveness, sustainability, and inclusiveness of each approach in policy development, highlighting both synergies and tensions. Evidence suggests that multilateral efforts provide more comprehensive frameworks for equity and shared governance, while bilateral partnerships offer targeted and flexible funding. However, the coexistence of these approaches sometimes leads to policy fragmentation and duplication. The review concludes with recommendations for greater harmonization, country ownership, and accountability mechanisms to enhance the long-term success of HIV/AIDS interventions in the region.

Keywords: HIV/AIDS policy, East Africa, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors.

INTRODUCTION

The HIV/AIDS epidemic continues to pose a major public health challenge across sub-Saharan Africa, and East Africa in particular bears a disproportionate share of this burden [1]. Countries such as Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania have experienced high HIV prevalence rates for decades, affecting millions of individuals and straining already fragile healthcare systems [2]. Since the onset of the epidemic in the 1980s, the region has relied heavily on a combination of national strategies and international cooperation to combat the spread of the disease, manage treatment, and support prevention programs [3].

HIV/AIDS in East Africa is more than a health issue, it is a deeply entrenched socio-economic and developmental crisis. The epidemic has had a profound impact on life expectancy, orphanhood, household income, and national productivity [4]. In response, both global and regional actors have mobilized significant resources to curb its spread. Among the most notable international actors are multilateral organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UNAIDS, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria [5]. Simultaneously, major bilateral donors—including the United States through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and European nations through direct development assistance have played pivotal roles in shaping HIV/AIDS responses in East Africa [6].

Multilateralism in this context refers to collaborative arrangements that involve multiple countries and international institutions working together under a unified framework. These organizations emphasize collective responsibility, shared governance, and standardized approaches to global health challenges. Conversely, bilateralism denotes a direct partnership between two countries, typically involving a donor and a recipient country. Bilateral engagements often reflect the foreign policy priorities of the donor country and may include specific conditions or expectations [7].

Over the years, these two paradigms—multilateral and bilateral cooperation—have coexisted, sometimes complementing each other and at other times creating tensions or duplications in program implementation [8]. Understanding how these frameworks have influenced HIV/AIDS policymaking and outcomes in East Africa is crucial for refining future strategies, especially as funding environments shift and as local governments assume greater ownership of their public health agendas.

Despite decades of investment and substantial progress in expanding antiretroviral therapy (ART), reducing mother-to-child transmission, and increasing awareness, East Africa continues to face significant challenges in managing HIV/AIDS [9]. The policy landscape is often fragmented, influenced by differing donor priorities, overlapping mandates, and fluctuating financial commitments. While international aid has undeniably strengthened healthcare systems and improved outcomes, questions remain about the sustainability, equity, and efficiency of externally driven interventions [10]. The dual presence of multilateral and bilateral cooperation frameworks has created a complex ecosystem of policy influences, technical assistance, and financial flows. However, it is not always clear which model yields the most effective outcomes in terms of policy coherence, service delivery, or local empowerment. Moreover, with increasing calls for country ownership and sustainability, there is a need to examine how these paradigms align—or conflict—with national health priorities and systems. A critical gap exists in the literature regarding comparative analyses of these international cooperation frameworks and their long-term impacts on HIV/AIDS policy and health outcomes in East Africa [11]. This review aims to bridge a critical knowledge gap by conducting a comparative analysis of multilateral and bilateral cooperation frameworks in the context of HIV/AIDS policy development and implementation in East Africa, specifically focusing on Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania. The primary objective is to examine how multilateral institutions (such as the United Nations, Global Fund, and WHO) and bilateral donors (such as PEPFAR and national development agencies) influence policy design, implementation, and outcomes. It will assess the mechanisms through which these actors operate, including funding modalities, technical assistance, and political engagement. The study will further evaluate the effectiveness of various implementation strategies employed under each framework, and how these impact the accessibility, quality, and sustainability of HIV/AIDS programs. By assessing health outcomes such as treatment coverage, prevention success, and mortality reduction, the review seeks to compare the practical impacts of multilateral versus bilateral engagement. Moreover, it will explore how these international cooperation models interact with national systems, including governance structures, community participation, and country ownership of health initiatives. Identifying lessons learned, best practices, and contextual enablers or barriers will inform more effective cooperation models. The overarching goal is to generate evidence-based policy recommendations for enhancing international collaboration in a way that aligns with national health strategies and regional development goals. The review is particularly relevant at a time when donor priorities are shifting, and recipient countries are striving to develop resilient, self-reliant health systems. The findings will be useful for policymakers, donors, researchers, and implementers seeking to improve coordination, optimize resource use, and ensure the long-term sustainability of HIV/AIDS interventions in East Africa. Ultimately, this review contributes to broader debates on global health governance by offering a nuanced, context-specific understanding of international aid dynamics and their implications for health outcomes and system strengthening.

Conceptual Overview

The global response to HIV/AIDS in East Africa is shaped by a blend of multilateral and bilateral approaches that leverage international partnerships, funding, and technical expertise to address the epidemic. Multilateralism entails cooperation among multiple nations through global or regional institutions to confront shared challenges [12]. Prominent multilateral actors in HIV/AIDS policy include UNAIDS, which plays a central coordinating role by aligning global HIV responses with national strategies, and the World Health Organization (WHO), which sets treatment guidelines and facilitates disease surveillance [5]. The Global Fund is another crucial multilateral entity, financing large-scale HIV prevention, care, and treatment initiatives through a country-led, performance-based funding model. In contrast, bilateralism refers to direct collaboration between two countries. Notable bilateral donors active in East Africa include PEPFAR—the largest global bilateral funder of HIV/AIDS interventions—providing critical funding, antiretroviral drugs, and capacity building. The UK's Department for International Development (DFID) focuses on strengthening health systems and promoting rights-based approaches, while Germany's GIZ offers technical assistance, training, and policy implementation support. Together, these multilateral and bilateral efforts create a comprehensive and synergistic framework, addressing both immediate clinical needs and long-term structural challenges in the fight against HIV/AIDS across the East African region.

Comparative Analysis

This analysis aims to critically examine the differences between multilateral and bilateral approaches in health aid, focusing on four key areas: policy development and ownership, funding mechanisms and sustainability, coordination and efficiency, and monitoring and accountability [13]. First, multilateral aid fosters national ownership by

encouraging recipient countries to lead planning through mechanisms like Country Coordinating Mechanisms, aligning policies with international norms and Sustainable Development Goals. In contrast, bilateral aid can sometimes prioritize donor agendas over national health strategies, though it offers the advantage of quickly responding to political changes and emerging needs. Second, multilateral funding pools resources, promoting equity and long-term sustainability by sharing risks among donors, whereas bilateral funds are often earmarked for specific goals or regions, risking dependency and short-term focus if donor interest declines. Third, multilateral aid enhances coordination and reduces program duplication through joint planning and monitoring, while bilateral aid risks fragmentation when donors operate independently of national systems or run parallel programs. Lastly, monitoring and accountability differ, with multilateral institutions supporting transparency via country progress reports, whereas bilateral donors emphasize performance-based accountability through rigorous monitoring and reporting systems, which may sometimes impose heavy administrative burdens on recipient countries. This comparative analysis aims to inform better integration of aid strategies for sustainable health outcomes [14].

Case Studies from East Africa

In examining the specific objectives related to HIV/AIDS interventions in East Africa, three country case studies like Uganda, Kenya, and Rwanda offer valuable insights into the successes and challenges of international aid programs [15]. Uganda, as one of the earliest beneficiaries of the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), witnessed significant declines in HIV incidence. However, initial efforts faced criticism for emphasizing abstinence-only education, which some argued limited the effectiveness of prevention messaging. The involvement of the Global Fund later expanded access to antiretroviral therapy (ART) and strengthened health infrastructure, closely aligning with Uganda's national HIV/AIDS strategies. Kenya's approach benefited from multilateral initiatives that integrated HIV and tuberculosis (TB) services, addressing co-infection challenges [16]. Bilateral aid from the U.S. and the United Kingdom specifically targeted adolescent health, promoted male circumcision campaigns, and facilitated behavior change communication, all contributing to a comprehensive, multisectoral HIV response. Rwanda stands out for its exemplary governance in donor coordination, efficiently utilizing both multilateral and bilateral funds. The Rwandan government maintained strong oversight to harmonize external support with national plans, deliberately avoiding fragmented or vertical programs. Together, these case studies highlight varied strategies and outcomes that inform future regional HIV/AIDS interventions [17].

Challenges and Gaps

The effective implementation of development programs often faces significant challenges and gaps that hinder progress toward specific objectives. One major issue is policy incoherence resulting from overlapping and sometimes conflicting interests of multiple donors. When different donors promote varying priorities and agendas, this can create confusion and fragmentation within national policy frameworks, making it difficult for governments to adopt cohesive strategies [18]. Additionally, some ministries or government agencies struggle with weak institutional capacity, limiting their ability to effectively coordinate, manage, and absorb the aid provided. This results in suboptimal use of resources and undermines program effectiveness. Another critical challenge is the political influence exerted by certain bilateral donors on sensitive social issues, such as reproductive rights and LGBTQ+ inclusion. Such influence can create tensions and restrict open dialogue or policy reforms in these areas, often hindering inclusive development. Moreover, the existence of data silos and parallel monitoring and evaluation systems further compounds inefficiencies. Without integrated data management and harmonized reporting frameworks, duplication of efforts and gaps in information sharing persist, impeding accurate assessment of progress and informed decision-making. Addressing these challenges requires strengthened coordination, capacity building, and alignment of donor efforts with national priorities to achieve sustainable development outcomes [19].

Opportunities for Integration

The integration of donor support with national and regional health systems presents significant opportunities to enhance healthcare outcomes through coordinated efforts. One key objective is to establish mutual accountability frameworks that align the goals and expectations of both donors and recipient countries [20]. Such frameworks ensure transparency, build trust, and foster collaborative partnerships where resources are efficiently utilized and outcomes are jointly monitored. Another critical opportunity lies in developing country compacts formal agreements that integrate bilateral and multilateral investments into a country's overarching health strategy. These compacts promote harmonization of funding streams, reduce duplication, and enhance sustainability by embedding external support within national priorities and systems. Additionally, regional bodies like the East African Community (EAC) play an important role in facilitating policy coherence across member states, thereby promoting unified approaches to health challenges that transcend borders. These organizations can also enable joint disease surveillance and response mechanisms, improving early detection and control of epidemics and pandemics. By capitalizing on these opportunities, health systems can strengthen their resilience, maximize the impact of investments, and ensure that

donor contributions support long-term, locally driven health improvements [21]. This integrated approach ultimately fosters greater health equity and regional cooperation.

CONCLUSION

This review highlights the complex interplay between multilateral and bilateral international organizations in shaping HIV/AIDS policy development in East Africa. Multilateral institutions such as UNAIDS, WHO, and the Global Fund play a crucial role in promoting coordinated, country-led strategies that emphasize equity, sustainability, and regional collaboration. Conversely, bilateral donors like PEPFAR and DFID offer targeted funding and flexibility, often reflecting donor priorities that can sometimes diverge from national agendas. While both approaches have contributed significantly to expanding access to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, their coexistence has occasionally resulted in fragmented policies, duplication of efforts, and challenges in harmonization. Strengthening mutual accountability frameworks, promoting country ownership through integrated national health strategies, and leveraging regional bodies like the East African Community for policy coherence are key to overcoming these challenges. Future success depends on better alignment and coordination between multilateral and bilateral efforts, ensuring that funding and technical assistance reinforce national priorities rather than compete with them. Ultimately, fostering inclusive, transparent partnerships will enhance the effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of HIV/AIDS interventions in East Africa, supporting resilient health systems capable of responding to evolving public health needs.

REFERENCES

1. Sia, D., Onadja, Y., Hajizadeh, M., Heymann, S.J., Brewer, T.F., Nandi, A.: What explains gender inequalities in HIV/AIDS prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa? Evidence from the demographic and health surveys. *BMC Public Health*. 16, 1136 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3783-5>
2. Obeagu, E. I., Aja, P. M., Okon, M. B., Uti, D. E. Reducing HIV Infection Rate in Women: A Catalyst to reducing HIV Infection pervasiveness in Africa. *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research*. 2023; 11(10):01-06. DOI: 10.58538/IJAR/2048
3. Adepoju A. O, Amusa M. O, Samson A.O. (2023). Inclusion of nutritional counseling and mental health services in HIV/AIDS management A paradigm shift *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2023;102(41):e35673. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000035673>
4. HopeSr., K.R.: Africa's HIV/AIDS Crisis in a Development Context. *International Relations*. 15, 15–36 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1177/004711701015006003>
5. HIV/AIDS | WHO | Regional Office for Africa, <https://www.afro.who.int/health-topics/hivaids>
6. Madu, C.V., Aloh, H.E., Egba, S.I., et al. The price of progress: Assessing the financial costs of HIV/AIDS management in East Africa. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2025 May 2;104(18):e42300. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000042300. PMID: 40324279; PMCID: PMC12055164.
7. Doble, A., Sheridan, Z., Razavi, A., Wilson, A., Okereke, E.: The role of international support programmes in global health security capacity building: A scoping review. *PLOS Glob Public Health*. 3, e0001763 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0001763>
8. Chang, M.: Bilateral and Multilateral Mechanisms in Comparison: An Examination Through China's Climate Policy. Presented at the January 28 (2022)
9. Alum, E.U., Uti, D.E., Ugwu, O.P.C., Alum, B.N. Toward a cure - Advancing HIV/AIDS treatment modalities beyond antiretroviral therapy: A Review. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2024 Jul 5;103(27):e38768. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000038768. PMID: 38968496
10. Agwu E, Ihongbe J. C, Ezeonwumelu J. O, Moazzam M, Lodhi M. M(2015). Baseline burden and antimicrobial susceptibility of pathogenic bacteria recovered from oral lesions of patients with HIV/AIDS in South-Western Uganda. *Oral Science International*, 12, (2), 59-66. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1348-8643\(15\)00018-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1348-8643(15)00018-X).
11. Brown, G.W., Rhodes, N., Tacheva, B., Loewenson, R., Shahid, M., Poitier, F.: Challenges in international health financing and implications for the new pandemic fund. *Globalization and Health*. 19, 97 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-023-00999-6>
12. Morse, J.C., Keohane, R.O.: Contested multilateralism. *The Review of International Organizations*. 9, 385–412 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-014-9188-2>
13. Ihongbe J C, Moazzam M I, Pazos V, Agwu E (2015). Non-target oral bacterial resistance to Cotrimoxazole in HIV/AIDS patients living in South Western Uganda. *Spec. Bact. Pathog. J*, 1, (1), 01-08.
14. Elendu, C., Amaechi, D.C., Elendu, T.C., Amaechi, E.C., Elendu, I.D., Akpa, K. N., et al.: Shaping sustainable paths for HIV/AIDS funding: a review and reminder. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 87, 1415–1445 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1097/MS9.0000000000002976>

15. Mugisha S, Agwu E (2015). Cross-border movement of people and its effect on the Spread of HIV/AIDS in Kisoro district south western Uganda. *Special viral Pathogens Journal*, 1, (1), 0026-0037.
16. Windisch, R., Waiswa, P., Neuhann, F., Scheibe, F., Savigny, D. de: Scaling up antiretroviral therapy in Uganda: using supply chain management to appraise health systems strengthening.
17. Ukaidi, C.U.A., Egba, S.I., Uti, D.E., Echegu, D.A. Confronting Dual Challenges: Substance Abuse and HIV/AIDS. *Elite Journal of HIV*, 2024; 2(5): 1-8.<https://eejournals.com/journals/EJHIV>
18. Lah, O.: Breaking the silos: integrated approaches to foster sustainable development and climate action. *Sustainable Earth Reviews*. 8, 1 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42055-024-00102-w>
19. Aja, P. M. and Okon, M. B. HIV Infection and Cardiovascular diseases: The obnoxious Duos. *Newport International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences (NIJRMS)*, 2023; 3(2): 95-99.
20. Okoroiwu H. U., Umoh E. A, Asanga E. E, Edet U. O, Atim-Ebim M. R, Tangban E. A, et al (2022). Thirty-five years (1986–2021) of HIV/AIDS in Nigeria: bibliometric and scoping analysis. *AIDS Research and Therapy*, 19, (1), 64.
21. Ndembi, N., Dereje, N., Nonvignon, J., Aragaw, M., Raji, T., Fallah, M.P., et al.: Financing pandemic prevention, preparedness and response: lessons learned and perspectives for future. *Global Health*. 20, 65 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-024-01066-4>

Nassimbwa Kabanda D. Multilateral vs. Bilateral Approaches: Comparing the Role of International Organizations in HIV/AIDS Policy Development in East Africa. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES, 6(2):46-50.