This open-access article is distributed under Creative Commons licence CC-BY-NC 4.0.

National Health Insurance in South Africa: A critical perspective on policy misalignment and constitutional constraints

N Mofolo,[1] MFamMed, DBA (Higher Education Management); **C Heunis,**[2] PhD (Sociology)

[1] *Department of Family Medicine, School of Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, South Africa*
[2] *Centre for Health Systems Research and Development, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa*

Corresponding author: *N Mofolo (mofolo.n@up.ac.za)*

South Africa (SA)'s National Health Insurance (NHI) Act, signed into law in May 2024, represents an ambitious attempt at healthcare transformation through universal health coverage (UHC). However, this perspective argues that despite laudable intentions, the NHI faces fundamental deployment obstacles rooted in systemic policy misalignment, fragmented governance structures and legal constraints. We present a critical analysis of five major constitutional violations, multi-departmental co-ordination failures and financial sustainability concerns that threaten the NHI's transformative potential. Our perspective challenges current execution strategies, and proposes that without comprehensive organisational reforms addressing constitutional alignment, inter-departmental co-ordination and fiscal realities, the NHI risks becoming an aspirational policy rather than an operational reality. This analysis aims to promote scientific discourse about the need for systemic reform as a prerequisite for successful UHC deployment in SA.

Keywords: national health insurance, health policy, constitutional reform, universal health coverage, South Africa, policy implementation

S Afr Med J 2026;116(2):e4237. https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2026.v116i2.4237

The signing of South Africa (SA)'s National Health Insurance (NHI) Act on 15 May 2024 marked what many celebrated as a historic milestone toward universal health coverage (UHC).[1] This landmark legislation promises to transform a fragmented health system into a unified framework, providing healthcare based on need rather than the ability to pay.[2]

However, our perspective challenges the predominant optimism among policy advocates surrounding this legislation, acknowledging that media and civil society commentary reflects substantial scepticism regarding implementation feasibility.

Addressing NHI proponents' arguments

While advocates argue that deployment obstacles are typical for transformative policies and can be resolved through adaptive management,[3] we contend that the scale and nature of legal, fiscal and co-ordination barriers represent fundamental organisational impediments rather than manageable execution difficulties.

This opinion piece frames the NHI's obstacles as symptoms of deeper systemic misalignment requiring constitutional, monetary and governance reform before meaningful progress can occur. As we have demonstrated previously,[3] health workforce policies were misaligned with NHI requirements even during preparatory phases. Such policy incoherence is inevitable given absent enabling organisational frameworks.

The constitutional crisis perspective

Our analysis reveals that the Act faces fundamental juridical crisis, rendering roll-out legally vulnerable. Legal analyses identify five major constitutional violations, making the NHI constitutionally untenable.[4,5]

Specific constitutional solutions required

Section 27 amendment: Explicitly define UHC achievement without restricting existing private medical schemes' healthcare access. Unlike current provisions that may force patients into inadequate public systems, amendments must guarantee enhanced rather than limited access options.

Section 22 clarification: Establish precise limitations on state regulatory powers over healthcare professionals. The Gauteng High Court's Certificate of Need (CoN) ruling[6] demonstrates that current regulatory frameworks systematically violate professional freedoms.

Provincial powers framework: Define exact circumstances permitting national legislation to override provincial health authority, with mandatory consultation processes. Current centralisation creates organisational tension between national imperatives and provincial autonomy.

Addressing counterarguments: Proponents argue that legal infractions can be resolved through legislative amendments rather than constitutional reform. However, the Board of Healthcare Funders court case[5] and Solidarity ruling[6] establish legal precedent suggesting deeper constitutional incompatibilities, requiring fundamental amendment rather than statutory adjustment.

International comparison: Unlike SA, successful UHC systems in Canada and Australia established clear legal frameworks before deployment, preventing the juridical vulnerabilities currently plaguing the NHI.[7]

Multi-departmental co-ordination: A systems failure perspective

These constitutional challenges are compounded by unprecedented co-ordination requirements across government departments. The NHI requires co-ordination across 12 government departments,[8]

yet institutional arrangements perpetuate the fragmentation that the policy seeks to address.

Specific co-ordination solutions

Mandatory intergovernmental framework: Establish legally binding co-operation processes, with performance indicators and penalties for non-compliance. Health infrastructure depends on public works departments, whose priorities diverge from health timelines, and Treasury controls allocations, potentially misaligned with NHI demands.

Integrated information systems: With debt-service costs now consuming >20% of government revenue, fiscal space for the substantial technological investment required by NHI is severely constrained.[9] NHI requires unified patient registration systems linking the departments of home affairs (identity verification) and social development (means testing), replacing independent operations that currently compromise service delivery efficiency.[10] Beyond administrative integration, success depends on interoperable electronic health records and billing systems across provincial boundaries and public-private interfaces.[10] Current fragmented digital infrastructure, with provinces and private entities operating incompatible systems, creates substantial co-ordination barriers requiring significant technological investment before implementation.

Fiscal reality: Current gross domestic product (GDP) growth, averaging 1.9% for 2025 - 2027, with debt-to-GDP ratios exceeding 73%,[11] makes sustainable NHI funding mathematically impossible without either significant tax increases or reduced service promises, neither of which existing policy acknowledges.

The brain drain challenge: Research shows that 914 900 South Africans had emigrated by mid-2020, 120 000 of whom had professional qualifications.[12,13] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development data indicate that >23 400 SA health professionals are working in the UK, New Zealand, the USA and Australia.[14] While advocates suggest skills retention programmes can address emigration, SA Reserve Bank data confirming debt-service costs reaching ZAR385.9 billion annually[9] indicate financial limitations preventing effective retention incentives.

Urban-rural disparities: Beyond regulatory solutions

Beyond co-ordination failures, regulatory approaches to health equity face fundamental limitations. Our perspective questions beliefs that regulatory instruments can address profound urban-rural health disparities, with only 12% of doctors and 19% of nurses working in rural areas despite rural populations comprising nearly half of the country's residents.[10] Rural areas lack the economic infrastructure, career development opportunities and quality-of-life amenities necessary to attract and retain healthcare professionals.[9,10]

The certificate of need misconception: The Gauteng High Court's unconstitutional declaration[6] requiring healthcare providers to obtain government approval before establishing new facilities, expanding services, or relocating practice validates our perspective that regulatory coercion cannot substitute for addressing fundamental monetary barriers.

Organisational solutions required: Rather than regulatory compulsion, rural healthcare requires comprehensive fiscal development addressing infrastructure, career opportunities and quality-of-life amenities. Brazil's successful rural health programmes succeeded through monetary incentives and infrastructure investment, not regulatory mandates, demonstrating organisational strategies' superiority over coercive instruments.[15]

Acknowledging the NHI's vision while challenging implementation

Despite these critical observations, we explicitly acknowledge the NHI's potential benefits: universal coverage, financial risk protection and improved service quality.[16] While advocates argue that existing difficulties reflect normal policy maturation requiring patience and adaptive management, the evidence of five legal infractions, multi-departmental failures and fiscal limitations suggests systemic rather than developmental problems.

The NHI addresses legitimate equity concerns by bridging the two-tiered system. However, socioeconomic inequalities[17] and employment obstacles limiting formal employment to 45% of working-age adults[18] constrain revenue generation essential for NHI sustainability.

Systemic reform requirements

Legal prerequisites

Successful NHI deployment requires three fundamental legal prerequisites that must be established before roll-out. These are: (*i*) a constitutional amendment defining state healthcare powers while protecting individual rights; (*ii*) an intergovernmental co-ordination Act establishing mandatory co-operation with dispute resolution mechanisms; and (*iii*) an economic sustainability provision requiring demonstrated fiscal capacity before implementation.

Performance monitoring framework

Constitutional amendments must mandate transparent performance metrics and independent evaluation mechanisms to ensure NHI accountability and enable course corrections during implementation phases.

Phased implementation strategy

This framework necessitates a five-phase deployment strategy that prioritises structural reform over immediate service expansion. The approach progresses sequentially through: (*i*) a constitutional phase (12 - 18 months) addressing legal framework deficiencies through parliamentary amendment processes; (*ii*) a governance phase (6 - 12 months) establishing functional co-ordination mechanisms across departments; (*iii*) an economic phase achieving minimum growth and employment targets; (*iv*) a pilot phase (12 - 24 months) testing integrated delivery in controlled environments; and finally, (*v*) a scale phase, expanding based on demonstrated success rather than policy promises.

While this approach requires substantial upfront investment in legal and institutional frameworks, international evidence demonstrates long-term cost savings through reduced implementation failures. This phased approach reflects successful international practices, particularly Taiwan's UHC deployment that established juridical clarity and monetary prerequisites before system-wide execution.[19] Such a systematic approach demonstrates that constitutional frameworks and fiscal sustainability represent prerequisites rather than outcomes of effective UHC implementation.

Evidence-based policy development

Moving beyond systemic reform requirements, sustainable NHI success demands evidence-driven approaches. We advocate evidence-based development acknowledging organisational limitations, rather

than assuming resolution through execution. While proponents suggest that difficulties can be overcome through incremental adjustments, the persistent departmental silos, regulatory gaps and fiscal unsustainability indicate that comprehensive organisational reform is necessary, rather than symptomatic interventions.

Existing strategies perpetuate rather than resolve systemic impediments to successful UHC. International experiences demonstrate that countries achieving sustainable UHC invested significantly in preparatory phases, contrasting sharply with SA's implementation-first approach.

Conclusion: A call for systemic reform

Our perspective presents a necessary critique to existing NHI methodologies while supporting the UHC vision. Good intentions cannot overcome the organisational misalignment, legal barriers and monetary restrictions that characterise present frameworks.

Evidence of constitutional violations, co-ordination failures and sustainability obstacles suggests that existing strategies will perpetuate rather than resolve systemic impediments. SA's path demands governance architecture, a juridical framework and fiscal policy transformation as deployment prerequisites.

While NHI advocates argue for patience and adaptive management, international evidence from successful UHC systems demonstrates that legal clarity, financial sustainability and co-ordinated governance represent prerequisites rather than outcomes of effective deployment.

The choice facing policy-makers is clear: pursue comprehensive organisational reform encompassing constitutional, monetary and governance dimensions before NHI execution, or accept continued policy failure while health inequities persist. Without addressing fundamental barriers, the NHI risks becoming another well-intentioned policy that fails to achieve transformative potential.

Declaration. None.

Acknowledgements. None.

Author contributions. NM conceived the idea, conducted the literature search, analysed the findings and took the lead in writing the initial perspective. CH contributed to the analysis of the findings, searched the databases, reviewed and edited the perspective and led the writing of the final manuscript.

Funding. None.

Conflicts of interest. None.

1. Simeka Health. South Africa's National Health Insurance Act: Paving the way for universal healthcare and equity. Cape Town: Simeka Health, 2024. https://www.simekahealth.co.za/south-africas-national-health-insurance-act-paving-the-way-for-universal-healthcare-and-equity/ (accessed 11 September 2025).
2. Bloom Insure. How will NHI affect healthcare in South Africa? Umhlanga: Bloom Insure, 2025. https://bloom.insure/how-will-nhi-affect-healthcare-in-south-africa/ (accessed 11 September 2025).
3. Mofolo N, Heunis C, Kigozi GN. Towards national health insurance: Alignment of strategic human resources in South Africa. Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med 2019;11(1):e1-e7. https://doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v11i1.1928
4. Schindlers Attorneys. Legal opinion on the constitutionality of the NHI Bill. Johannesburg: Schindlers Attorneys, 2024. https://www.schindlers.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Legal-Opinion-on-the-Constitutionality-of-the-NHI-Bill-Sarah-Turbo-AI-.pdf (accessed 11 September 2025).
5. Board of Healthcare Funders of Southern Africa NPC v President of the Republic of South Africa. Gauteng Division, Pretoria. 2025. Case No: 28367/2024. https://lawlibrary.org.za/akn/za-gp/judgment/zagpphc/2025/473/eng@2025-05-06 (accessed 13 September 2025).
6. Medical Brief. Union takes fight against 'certificate of need' to top court. Cape Town: Medical Brief, 2024. https://www.medicalbrief.co.za/solidarity-challenges-nhi-certificate-of-need-cape-fires-legal-challenge/ (accessed 12 September 2025).
7. Philippon DJ, Braithwaite J. Health system organisation and governance in Canada and Australia: A comparison of historical developments, recent policy changes and future implications. Healthcare Policy 2008;4(1):e168-e186.
8. National Department of Health, South Africa. NHI implementation: Institutions, bodies and commissions. Government Gazette No. 40969, 2017. https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201707/40969gon660.pdf (accessed 11 September 2025).
9. Mamburu M. The financial stability considerations of fiscal sustainability. South African Reserve Bank Topical Briefing, 2024. https://www.resbank.co.za/content/dam/sarb/what-we-do/financial-stability/Topical Briefing_Financial stability considerations of fiscal sustainability.pdf (accessed 14 September 2025).
10. Rensburg R. Urban-rural inequalities will hamper a successful NHI. Health-e News, April 2019. https://health-e.org.za/2019/04/10/rural-versus-urban-towards-a-nhi/ (accessed 13 September 2025).
11. National Treasury, South Africa. Budget review 2025: Economic outlook. Pretoria: National Treasury, 2025. https://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/National Budget/2024/review/Chapter 2.pdf (accessed 12 September 2025).
12. Yu D. The impact of international migration on skills supply and demand in South Africa. Afr Hum Mobil Rev 2022;8(2):148-173.
13. Scalabrini Institute for Human Mobility in Africa. South Africa migration profile. SIHMA, 2022. https://sihma.org.za/african-migration-statistics/country/south-africa (accessed 12 September 2025).
14. Govender I. Brain drain in South Africa is affecting health care. S Afr Fam Pract 2024;66(1):e1-e2. https://doi.org/10.4102/safp.v66i1.5830
15. World Bank. Brazil: Community-driven development in rural communities of the northeast. Washington DC: World Bank, 2024. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/998221468743762314/pdf/308030BR0Northeast0ed01see0also0307591.pdf (accessed 16 September 2025).
16. National Department of Health, South Africa. Benefits of NHI. Pretoria: NDoH, 2024. https://www.health.gov.za/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Leaflet-1-NHI-FAQs-Benefits-of-NHI.pdf (accessed 11 September 2025).
17. Ataguba JE. Changes in socioeconomic inequality in self-assessed health in South Africa: The contributions of changes in inequalities between and within socioeconomic groups. SSM Popul Health 2025;29:101755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2025.101755
18. National Economic Development and Labour Council. Economic and employment trends in South Africa. NEDLAC, March 2024. https://nedlac.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Economic-and-Employment-Trends-in-South-Africa_March-2024.pdf (accessed 13 September 2025).
19. Lu JF, Chiang TL. Developing an adequate supply of health services: Taiwan's path to UHC. Soc Sci Med 2018;198:7-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.017

Received 17 September 2025; accepted 2 October 2025.