Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research

Received 21 July 2026
Revised 25 Aug 2026
Accepted 10 Sep 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (22s): 1583–1595

KEYWORDS:
health system resilience; workforce integration; interprofessional collaboration; risk management; business continuity; artificial intelligence; digital health; Saudi Arabia; Vision 2030

Strengthening Healthcare System Resilience Through Workforce Integration, Risk Management, and Advanced Health Technologies

Abdulmajeed Ali Ahmed Hamithi[1], Taif Mohammed Alenzi[2], Meshari Mushabab Alsirhani[3], Seada Hassan Saleh Alsaiari[4], Ali Mushabbab Oudah Alshahrani[5], Manzil Oshaywi Sabih Alsharari[6], Abdulrahman Ahmed Elthagafi[7], Abdulrahman Kasib Ayed Al-Anzi[8], Fahad Muteb Alharbi[9], Abdulaziz Alhurayr M Alqahtani[10]

[1] Public Health, Ministry of Defense
[2] Medical secretary, Ministry of Defense
[3] Radiology Resident, Ministry of Defens
[4] Nurse specialist, Sharurah Armed Forces Hospital
[5] Laboratories Technician
[6] Health Information Technician, National guard health affairs
[7] Medical Information Technician, Al-Hada Military Hospital Taif
[8] Social Worker, Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs
[9] Health Assistant, National Guard Health Affairs
[10] Health Technician, Ministry of Defense

ABSTRACT:

Background: Health systems face growing pressure from pandemics, demographic change, chronic disease, workforce shortages, climate-related hazards, and cyber threats. Resilience, the capacity to anticipate, absorb, adapt to, and learn from shocks while maintaining essential services, has become a strategic priority. Workforce, risk management, and technology are often addressed separately, although each depends on the others.

Objective: To examine how three interdependent pillars, workforce integration, risk management, and advanced health technologies, can jointly strengthen health system resilience, and to propose an integrative framework applicable to the Saudi health system under Vision 2030.

Methods: A narrative integrative review of international and Saudi literature, anchored in health system resilience theory, sociotechnical systems theory, resilience engineering, and high-reliability organizing.

Results: Integrated interprofessional workforces, flexible scopes of practice, and strategic workforce planning increase adaptive capacity. Enterprise risk management, proactive tools such as failure mode and effects analysis, systems-based incident learning, and business continuity management increase absorptive capacity. Artificial intelligence, virtual care, interoperable data, remote monitoring, and command centers enhance anticipation

Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

and response, but introduce new risks related to bias, cybersecurity, and dependence on digital systems. The greatest gains arise when the three pillars are designed together.

Conclusion: The proposed NEXUS Framework (Networked workforce, Enterprise risk intelligence, eXtended digital capability, Unified data and interoperability, Sustained learning and adaptation) offers a practical structure for health clusters, institutions, and regulators to build resilience in an integrated way.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Health systems operate in an environment of increasing uncertainty. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted care in almost every country, while longer-term pressures, including population ageing, the rising burden of non-communicable diseases, global shortages of health workers, climate-related hazards, and the growing frequency of cyberattacks, continue to strain capacity. In response, the concept of **health system resilience** has moved from academic discussion to the center of health policy. Kruk et al. (2015) described resilience as the capacity of health actors, institutions, and populations to prepare for and respond effectively to crises, to maintain core functions, and to reorganize when conditions require it. A comparative analysis of the COVID-19 response in 28 countries found that resilience depended on governance, health workforce capacity, information systems, and the ability to maintain essential services, and that weaknesses in any of these areas reduced overall performance (Haldane et al., 2021).

Three domains repeatedly emerge as decisive. The first is the **workforce**: no plan can succeed without professionals who are available, competent, coordinated, and willing to adapt. The second is **risk management**: systems that identify, assess, and control risks before they materialize are better able to absorb shocks. The third is **technology**: digital health, data systems, and artificial intelligence (AI) can extend the reach of scarce professionals, detect threats earlier, and support decisions. The World Health Organization's strategies on human resources for health and on digital health both emphasize that these domains must be developed together, within strong governance (World Health Organization [WHO], 2016, 2021b).

1.2 Problem Statement

In practice, these domains are often managed by different departments with different priorities. Human resources departments plan staffing, quality and risk departments manage incidents and accreditation, and information technology departments implement systems. Technology projects are sometimes introduced without adequate workforce preparation or risk assessment; risk registers may ignore digital and workforce risks; and workforce plans may not account for the ways technology changes roles. This fragmentation limits resilience, because shocks rarely respect departmental boundaries.

1.3 Aim and Objectives

This paper aims to examine how workforce integration, risk management, and advanced health technologies can jointly strengthen health system resilience. Its objectives are to:

- Clarify the conceptual links between resilience and the three pillars.
- Synthesize evidence on effective strategies within each pillar, including their limitations and risks.
- Propose the NEXUS Framework, which integrates the three pillars into a coherent model.
- Provide recommendations and an implementation roadmap for the Saudi health system in the context of Vision 2030.

2. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Dimensions of Resilience

Resilience is commonly described in terms of three capacities. **Absorptive** capacity is the ability to withstand a shock using existing resources and buffers. **Adaptive** capacity is the ability to adjust by reorganizing resources, roles, and processes. **Transformative** capacity is the ability to make lasting structural change in response to new conditions (Thomas et al., 2020).

Blanchet et al. (2017) argued that these capacities depend on the governance of knowledge, uncertainty, interdependence, and legitimacy. Resilience engineering adds a functional perspective: resilient systems are able to respond, monitor, anticipate, and learn (Hollnagel, 2014).

2.2 Sociotechnical Systems Theory

Sociotechnical theory holds that organizational performance arises from the interaction of social elements (people, roles, culture) and technical elements (tools, technologies, processes), and that optimizing one without the other produces poor results. Sittig and Singh (2010) applied this view to health information technology, proposing that safe and effective use depends on eight interacting dimensions: hardware and software, clinical content, the human–computer interface, people, workflow and communication, internal organizational policies, external rules and regulations, and system measurement and monitoring. The model explains why technology alone does not create resilience: its value depends on the workforce that uses it and on the risk management that governs it.

2.3 Safety-II and High-Reliability Organizing

The Safety-II perspective argues that safety and resilience arise from the ability of people to adjust their performance to varying conditions, so that organizations should understand and support everyday adaptation as well as investigate failures (Hollnagel, 2014; Braithwaite et al., 2015). High-reliability organizing describes how organizations operating in hazardous conditions sustain performance through preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify, sensitivity to operations, commitment to resilience, and deference to expertise (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015).

Table 1. The three pillars and their contribution to resilience capacities

Pillar	Absorptive capacity	Adaptive capacity	Transformative capacity
Workforce integration	Staffing reserves; cross-trained staff; retention	Flexible scopes of practice; redeployment; interprofessional teams	New roles and models of care; workforce planning
Risk management	Business continuity plans; redundancy; stockpiles	Real-time risk assessment; incident command; dynamic risk registers	Organizational learning from incidents; redesign of systems
Advanced health technologies	Backup systems; cybersecurity; downtime procedures	Telehealth; remote monitoring; real-time dashboards	AI-enabled prediction; integrated data platforms; new digital services

3. METHODOLOGY

This paper adopts a narrative integrative review design, appropriate for synthesizing heterogeneous evidence, including empirical studies, systematic reviews, international standards, and policy documents, into a conceptual model. Sources were identified through PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, and from WHO, International Organization for Standardization (ISO), and Saudi government publications, using terms related to health system resilience, interprofessional collaboration, workforce planning, risk management, business continuity, artificial intelligence, telehealth, interoperability, and cybersecurity. Findings were synthesized thematically within the three pillars and then integrated using the theoretical perspectives described in Section 2.

4. PILLAR ONE: WORKFORCE INTEGRATION

4.1 Interprofessional Collaboration

Workforce integration refers to the extent to which professionals from different disciplines, settings, and organizations work together as coordinated teams with shared goals. The WHO identified interprofessional education and collaborative practice as key strategies for strengthening health systems and improving outcomes (WHO, 2010). The Interprofessional Education

Collaborative defined four core competency domains: values and ethics, roles and responsibilities, interprofessional communication, and teams and teamwork (Interprofessional Education Collaborative [IPEC], 2016). A Cochrane review of practice-based interventions to improve interprofessional collaboration found that such interventions may slightly improve patient functional status, adherence to recommended practices, and use of healthcare resources, although the certainty of evidence was low and further research is needed (Reeves et al., 2017).

Teamwork research has identified the mechanisms through which integration supports performance: shared mental models, closed-loop communication, mutual performance monitoring, backup behavior, and psychological safety (Rosen et al., 2018). These mechanisms are precisely those that enable adaptation under pressure. Teams whose members understand one another's roles can redistribute work quickly, detect errors early, and maintain coordination when routines break down.

4.2 Flexible Scopes of Practice and Task-Sharing

Task-sharing, the rational redistribution of tasks among health workforce teams, can increase capacity when specialists are scarce. WHO recommendations on task shifting describe how appropriately trained and supported health workers can safely take on tasks previously reserved for more specialized professionals (WHO, 2008). During COVID-19, many systems expanded the roles of nurses, pharmacists, paramedics, and allied health professionals, for example in vaccination, telephone triage, and home-based care. Such flexibility increases adaptive capacity, but must be supported by clear competency frameworks, supervision, regulatory authorization, and liability protection, so that adaptation does not compromise safety.

4.3 Strategic Workforce Planning and Surge Capacity

The WHO Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health: Workforce 2030 called on countries to align investment in the health workforce with current and future population needs, to optimize the performance and distribution of existing workers, and to strengthen workforce data and planning (WHO, 2016). Resilient workforce planning goes beyond calculating staffing ratios. It includes scenario-based planning for surges, registries of cross-trained staff and reserve professionals, mutual aid arrangements across facilities and regions, and the use of workforce analytics to anticipate shortages.

4.4 Wellbeing and Retention

A workforce cannot provide resilience if it is depleted. Crises expose professionals to infection, moral distress, and exhaustion, and sustained pressure increases burnout and turnover. Shanafelt et al. (2020) summarized what professionals need from their organizations during crises: to be heard, protected, prepared, supported, and cared for. Investments in safe staffing, psychological support, fair scheduling, and leadership communication are therefore resilience investments, not merely welfare measures, because retaining experienced staff preserves the knowledge and relationships on which adaptive capacity depends.

4.5 The Saudi Workforce Context

The Saudi health workforce is undergoing rapid change. Workforce localization programs aim to increase the proportion of Saudi nationals across professions, while the system continues to rely substantially on expatriate professionals. Nursing transformation has been identified as a priority, with recommendations to align nursing education, regulation, and leadership with Vision 2030 (Alsufyani et al., 2020). The Saudi Commission for Health Specialties (SCFHS) regulates professional classification, registration, and continuing professional development, while the restructuring of services into health clusters creates opportunities for workforce planning and sharing across hospitals and primary care networks (Ministry of Health, 2017; Health Sector Transformation Program, 2021). Integrating interprofessional competencies into education and continuing professional development, and building cluster-level surge workforce registries, would strengthen adaptive capacity.

Table 2. Mechanisms of workforce integration and their resilience benefits

Mechanism	Description	Resilience benefit
Interprofessional education	Shared learning across professions before and after qualification	Understanding of roles; effective communication in crisis

Mechanism	Description	Resilience benefit
Team-based models of care	Care delivered by defined interprofessional teams	Redistribution of work; mutual monitoring
Task-sharing with competency frameworks	Authorized expansion of roles with training and supervision	Increased capacity when specialists are scarce
Cross-training and surge registries	Preparing staff for redeployment to high-demand areas	Rapid scaling of critical services
Cluster-level workforce sharing	Pooling staff across facilities within a health cluster	Flexible response to localized surges
Wellbeing and retention programs	Support services, safe staffing, and recognition	Preservation of experienced workforce

5. PILLAR TWO: RISK MANAGEMENT

5.1 Enterprise Risk Management

Risk management in healthcare has traditionally focused on clinical incidents and liability. Enterprise risk management (ERM) broadens the scope to include strategic, operational, financial, workforce, technological, reputational, and external risks, managed within a single governance framework. The international standard ISO 31000 describes risk management as an integrated, structured, customized, inclusive, and dynamic process of identifying, analyzing, evaluating, treating, monitoring, and communicating risks (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2018). Kaplan and Mikes (2012) distinguished preventable risks, which should be eliminated through rules and controls; strategic risks, which are accepted in pursuit of objectives and must be managed; and external risks, which cannot be controlled and require identification and mitigation. Many of the shocks that test health system resilience, such as pandemics and natural disasters, are external risks that demand preparedness rather than prevention.

5.2 Proactive Risk Assessment

Proactive tools identify risks before harm occurs. Healthcare Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (HFMEA), developed by the U.S. Veterans Affairs National Center for Patient Safety, provides a structured process in which an interdisciplinary team maps a process, identifies potential failure modes, assesses their severity and probability, and designs controls (DeRosier et al., 2002). Hazard vulnerability analysis assesses the likelihood and impact of external hazards, such as floods, power failures, or mass casualty events, on a facility. Risk registers record identified risks, their owners, controls, and status. To support resilience, these tools should explicitly include workforce risks (for example, dependence on a small number of specialists) and digital risks (for example, single points of failure in information systems).

5.3 Learning from Incidents

Incident reporting and investigation are the primary reactive tools of risk management. Reason's (2000) systems approach holds that errors are consequences rather than causes, shaped by latent conditions in the system. Root cause analysis (RCA) is widely used to investigate serious incidents, but critics have noted that it often focuses on a single root cause, produces weak recommendations such as retraining or policy reminders, and lacks follow-up on implementation (Peerally et al., 2017). Stronger approaches emphasize systems analysis, the involvement of frontline staff and patients, and recommendations that change system design. Learning should also come from what goes right: studying how teams successfully adapt under pressure, in line with Safety-II, can reveal strengths to reinforce (Braithwaite et al., 2015).

5.4 Business Continuity Management

Business continuity management ensures that critical services continue during disruptions. ISO 22301 sets out requirements for a business continuity management system, including business impact analysis, continuity strategies, plans, exercises, and continual improvement (ISO, 2019). In healthcare, business continuity planning identifies essential services, the resources on which they depend (staff, supplies, power, water, information systems), the maximum tolerable period of disruption, and alternative arrangements. The COVID-19 experience showed the importance of maintaining essential services such as chronic disease care, maternal health, and vaccination during crises, because their disruption causes indirect harm that can rival the direct impact of the shock (Kruk et al., 2015; Haldane et al., 2021).

5.5 Embedding Risk Controls in Clinical Practice

Risk management becomes effective when controls are built into everyday clinical work. A well-known example is the Michigan Keystone ICU project, in which a simple evidence-based checklist, combined with culture change and measurement, produced a large and sustained reduction in catheter-related bloodstream infections across many intensive care units (Pronovost et al., 2006).

Table 3. Risk management tools across the resilience cycle

Tool	Purpose	Resilience phase	Key success factors
Enterprise risk register (ISO 31000)	Identify and track risks across all domains	Anticipate	Board oversight; named risk owners; regular review
Hazard vulnerability analysis	Assess likelihood and impact of external hazards	Anticipate	All-hazards scope; community and regional input
Healthcare FMEA	Prospectively analyze high-risk processes	Anticipate / absorb	Interdisciplinary team; focus on strong controls
Business continuity plans (ISO 22301)	Maintain critical services during disruption	Absorb / adapt	Business impact analysis; regular exercises
Incident command system	Coordinate response with clear roles	Respond / adapt	Training; predefined roles for each profession
Systems-based incident analysis	Learn from adverse events	Learn	Frontline involvement; system-level actions; follow-up
After-action reviews and Safety-II learning	Learn from responses and successes	Learn / transform	Psychological safety; implementation tracking

6. PILLAR THREE: ADVANCED HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES

6.1 Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Analytics

AI and machine learning offer powerful tools for anticipating and responding to pressure. Applications include predicting patient deterioration, forecasting demand for beds and staff, detecting outbreaks from surveillance data, supporting diagnostic imaging, and optimizing supply chains (Rajkomar et al., 2019; Topol, 2019). By anticipating surges and identifying high-risk patients earlier, AI can strengthen the anticipatory function of resilience.

However, the evidence also highlights important risks. An external validation of a widely implemented proprietary sepsis prediction model found substantially poorer performance than reported by its developer, with many alerts and many missed cases (Wong et al., 2021). An analysis of a commercial algorithm used to manage population health found racial bias arising from the use of healthcare costs as a proxy for health needs (Obermeyer et al., 2019). A living systematic review of COVID-19 prediction models found that most were at high risk of bias and not recommended for clinical use (Wynants et al., 2020). These findings show that AI can introduce new failure modes, including poor generalization, bias, alert fatigue, and over-reliance, and must be governed within the risk management pillar. The WHO guidance on the ethics and governance of AI for health and the Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority's AI ethics principles both emphasize transparency, accountability, fairness, and human oversight (WHO, 2021a; Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority [SDAIA], 2023b).

6.2 Telehealth and Virtual Care

Telehealth extends the reach of scarce professionals, maintains access when physical access is restricted, and reduces exposure to infection. During COVID-19, telemedicine expanded rapidly and allowed many patients to continue receiving care while protecting patients and staff (Hollander & Carr, 2020; Keesara et al., 2020). Saudi Arabia expanded virtual services extensively during the pandemic through national applications and platforms (Hassounah et al., 2020), and has since developed large-scale virtual hospital services that connect specialists with facilities across the Kingdom. Virtual care strengthens adaptive capacity by allowing expertise to be redeployed digitally rather than physically.

6.3 Interoperability and Integrated Data

Resilience depends on timely, accurate, and shared information. Interoperability, the ability of different systems to exchange and use data, allows patient information to follow the patient across settings and allows managers to see the status of the whole system in real time. Standards such as HL7 Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR), and platforms built on them such as SMART on FHIR, enable applications to work across different electronic health record systems (Mandel et al., 2016). Information technology can improve safety by supporting decision-making and reducing errors, but poorly designed or poorly integrated systems can create new risks (Bates & Gawande, 2003; Institute of Medicine [IOM], 2012). In Saudi Arabia, the Nphies platform for insurance and health information exchange and the unified electronic health record initiatives of the Ministry of Health provide a foundation for integrated data.

6.4 Remote Monitoring and Command Centers

Remote patient monitoring, using connected devices and wearable sensors, allows clinicians to follow patients with chronic diseases or recovering from acute illness at home, reducing pressure on hospital beds and enabling early intervention. Health system command centers bring together real-time data on bed occupancy, emergency department flow, transfers, staffing, and supplies, enabling managers to anticipate bottlenecks and coordinate responses across facilities. Command centers integrate all three pillars: they depend on interoperable data, are staffed by interprofessional teams, and function as the operational hub of risk management.

6.5 Cybersecurity and Digital Risk

As dependence on technology grows, so does vulnerability to digital failure. Ransomware attacks on healthcare delivery organizations increased markedly between 2016 and 2021 (Neprash et al., 2022), and attacks that disable information systems force clinicians to revert to manual processes, delaying care and increasing error (Argaw et al., 2020). Digital resilience therefore requires cybersecurity controls, tested downtime procedures, offline backups, and staff trained to work without systems. In Saudi Arabia, the National Cybersecurity Authority's Essential Cybersecurity Controls and the Personal Data Protection Law establish requirements for protecting systems and health data (National Cybersecurity Authority, 2018; SDAIA, 2023a).

Table 4. Advanced health technologies: resilience benefits and associated risks

Technology	Resilience benefit	Key risks	Required safeguards
AI and predictive analytics	Early warning; demand forecasting; decision support	Bias; poor generalization; alert fatigue; over-reliance	Local validation; monitoring; human oversight; ethics governance
Telehealth and virtual hospitals	Extended reach; continuity of care; reduced exposure	Digital exclusion; missed physical signs; fragmentation	Clear triage criteria; integration with in-person care
Interoperable EHR and data platforms	Shared information; system-wide visibility	Data quality errors; privacy breaches	Data governance; standards (FHIR); access controls
Remote monitoring and IoT devices	Home-based care; early intervention	Device failure; data overload; security vulnerabilities	Escalation protocols; device security; workload planning
Command centers	Real-time coordination across facilities	Dependence on data accuracy and connectivity	Redundant connectivity; trained interprofessional staff
Cybersecurity systems	Protection of digital infrastructure	Evolving threats; human error	NCA controls; staff training; downtime drills

7. INTEGRATING THE PILLARS: THE NEXUS FRAMEWORK

The evidence reviewed shows that each pillar contributes to resilience, but that each also depends on the others. Technology without a prepared workforce is underused or misused; workforce flexibility without risk management can compromise safety; and risk management without data and technology lacks timely information. To capture these interdependencies, this paper proposes the **NEXUS Framework**, in which resilience emerges from the connection, or nexus, between people, risk, and technology.

Table 5. The NEXUS Framework for integrated health system resilience

Component	Description	Pillars integrated	Example indicators
N – Networked workforce	Interprofessional teams, flexible scopes of practice, and cluster-level workforce sharing	Workforce; technology (virtual care)	Cross-trained staff ratio; vacancy rate; staff retention; wellbeing scores
E – Enterprise risk intelligence	ERM, proactive risk assessment, business continuity, and incident command	Risk; workforce; technology	Risk register coverage; continuity plans tested; time to activate incident command

Component	Description	Pillars integrated	Example indicators
X – eXtended digital capability	Telehealth, AI decision support, remote monitoring, and command centers governed safely	Technology; workforce; risk	Virtual consultation share; validated AI tools in use; downtime drill results
U – Unified data and interoperability	Integrated, secure, high-quality data across settings	Technology; risk	Interoperable systems; data quality metrics; cybersecurity compliance
S – Sustained learning and adaptation	Learning from incidents, successes, and exercises; transformation after shocks	All three pillars	After-action reviews completed; recommendations implemented; new models of care adopted

7.1 How the Components Interact

The NEXUS components reinforce one another. Unified data (U) feeds enterprise risk intelligence (E) and extended digital capability (X), enabling command centers and predictive tools to anticipate pressure. Risk intelligence identifies where the networked workforce (N) is vulnerable and where digital tools could extend capacity. The networked workforce, in turn, is the means through which digital tools are used safely and risks are managed in practice. Sustained learning (S) connects all components over time, ensuring that lessons from incidents, exercises, and real crises lead to changes in staffing models, risk controls, and technology design.

For example, when a respiratory infection surge is forecast by a demand model (X, U), the risk management function activates surge plans (E), the workforce function redeploys cross-trained nurses and expands virtual follow-up (N, X), and after the surge the organization reviews performance and updates its plans (S).

Resilience lives in the connections: between professionals, between risks and responses, and between people and the technologies that support them.

7.2 Governance of the Framework

Applying NEXUS requires governance that crosses traditional boundaries. A resilience committee at the health cluster or institutional level, including leaders of human resources, quality and risk, information technology, clinical services, and emergency management, can oversee a shared resilience plan and dashboard. Board-level oversight ensures that resilience is treated as a strategic priority.

8. THE SAUDI CONTEXT AND VISION 2030

Saudi Arabia is well positioned to apply an integrated approach. Its experience with MERS-CoV strengthened infection prevention, laboratory capacity, and surveillance, and this experience informed a rapid and coordinated COVID-19 response (Algaissi et al., 2020). Digital applications supported contact tracing, appointments, vaccination, and access to care during the pandemic (Hassounah et al., 2020). Vision 2030 and the Health Sector Transformation Program are restructuring services into health clusters under the Health Holding Company, implementing a new Model of Care, and expanding digital and virtual services (Ministry of Health, 2017; Health Sector Transformation Program, 2021).

A strong regulatory and institutional environment supports each pillar. SCFHS supports workforce competence and continuing professional development; CBAHI accreditation standards address risk management, emergency preparedness, and information management; the Saudi Patient Safety Center promotes safety culture and learning; the Saudi Food and Drug Authority regulates medical devices, including software and AI-based devices; the National Cybersecurity Authority sets cybersecurity controls; and SDAIA governs data protection and AI ethics. The challenge is to connect these mechanisms so that workforce, risk, and technology are planned together at the level of each health cluster. Remaining gaps include variable digital maturity across

regions, the need for local validation of AI tools, workforce shortages in some specialties, and the need to integrate the private sector into resilience planning.

9. Recommendations and Implementation Roadmap

Building integrated resilience is a long-term effort. Table 6 proposes a phased roadmap, linking actions to the NEXUS components.

Table 6. Phased implementation roadmap

Phase	Key actions	NEXUS components
Short term (0–12 months)	Establish cluster-level resilience committees; conduct integrated risk assessment covering workforce, clinical, and digital risks; test downtime procedures; launch surge workforce registries	E, N, U
Medium term (1–3 years)	Implement interprofessional simulation programs; expand telehealth and remote monitoring with clear protocols; develop command centers; establish local validation and monitoring of AI tools; integrate business continuity under ISO 22301 principles	N, X, E, U
Long term (3–5 years)	Achieve interoperable data across clusters and sectors; embed resilience indicators in accreditation and performance frameworks; institutionalize Safety-II learning and after-action review; adopt new models of care based on lessons learned	U, S, all

In addition, several cross-cutting recommendations apply:

- **Integrate planning:** workforce, risk, and digital strategies should be developed jointly, with shared objectives and indicators.
- **Prepare the workforce for technology:** every major technology implementation should include workforce training, workflow redesign, and risk assessment, consistent with sociotechnical principles.
- **Govern AI responsibly:** require local validation, bias assessment, performance monitoring, and human oversight for AI tools in clinical and operational use.
- **Protect the workforce:** treat staff wellbeing and retention as core resilience investments.
- **Measure resilience:** develop a resilience dashboard combining workforce, risk, and technology indicators for each health cluster.

10. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper is a narrative review and does not use a systematic search or formal quality appraisal; relevant studies may therefore have been omitted. Evidence on the combined effect of workforce, risk, and technology interventions on resilience is limited, and much of the available literature is descriptive or derived from the COVID-19 period. The evidence on AI in particular is developing rapidly, and findings may change. The NEXUS Framework is conceptual and requires empirical testing. Future research should develop and validate resilience indicators for health clusters, evaluate integrated interventions using mixed methods, and examine the safety and equity of AI and virtual care in the Saudi context.

11. CONCLUSION

Resilient health systems are built at the intersection of people, risk management, and technology. An integrated, interprofessional workforce provides the adaptive capacity to respond to shocks; enterprise risk management, business

continuity, and systems-based learning provide the structures to anticipate and absorb them; and advanced health technologies extend capacity, improve foresight, and enable coordination, provided they are governed safely. Each pillar is necessary but insufficient on its own. The NEXUS Framework offers a practical way to connect them, so that health clusters and institutions can plan, measure, and improve resilience as a whole. For Saudi Arabia, the convergence of Vision 2030 reforms, digital transformation, and accumulated experience in crisis management provides a strong foundation for building a health system that can protect patients and maintain essential services in the face of future challenges.

DECLARATIONS

Funding: [To be completed by the author(s).]

Conflicts of interest: [To be completed by the author(s).]

Use of AI tools: [Authors should disclose any use of AI-assisted writing tools in line with the target journal's policy.]

REFERENCES

[1] Algaissi, A. A., Alharbi, N. K., Hassanain, M., & Hashem, A. M. (2020). Preparedness and response to COVID-19 in Saudi Arabia: Building on MERS experience. Journal of Infection and Public Health, 13(6), 834–838. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.04.016

[2] Alsufyani, A. M., Alforihidi, M. A., Almalki, K. E., Aljuaid, S. M., Alamri, A. A., & Alghamdi, M. S. (2020). Linking the Saudi Arabian 2030 vision with nursing transformation in Saudi Arabia: Roadmap for nursing policies and strategies. International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences, 13, 100256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2020.100256

[3] Argaw, S. T., Troncoso-Pastoriza, J. R., Lacey, D., Florin, M.-V., Calcavecchia, F., Anderson, D., et al. (2020). Cybersecurity of hospitals: Discussing the challenges and working towards mitigating the risks. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 20, 146. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-020-01161-7

[4] Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. (2003). Improving safety with information technology. New England Journal of Medicine, 348(25), 2526–2534. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa020847

[5] Blanchet, K., Nam, S. L., Ramalingam, B., & Pozo-Martin, F. (2017). Governance and capacity to manage resilience of health systems: Towards a new conceptual framework. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 6(8), 431–435. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.36

[6] Braithwaite, J., Wears, R. L., & Hollnagel, E. (2015). Resilient health care: Turning patient safety on its head. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 27(5), 418–420. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzv063

[7] DeRosier, J., Stalhandske, E., Bagian, J. P., & Nudell, T. (2002). Using health care Failure Mode and Effect Analysis: The VA National Center for Patient Safety's prospective risk analysis system. The Joint Commission Journal on Quality Improvement, 28(5), 248–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1070-3241(02)28025-6

[8] Haldane, V., De Foo, C., Abdalla, S. M., Jung, A.-S., Tan, M., Wu, S., et al. (2021). Health systems resilience in managing the COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons from 28 countries. Nature Medicine, 27(6), 964–980. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01381-y

[9] Hassounah, M., Raheel, H., & Alhefzi, M. (2020). Digital response during the COVID-19 pandemic in Saudi Arabia. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22(9), e19338. https://doi.org/10.2196/19338

[10] Health Sector Transformation Program. (2021). Health Sector Transformation Program delivery plan. Vision 2030, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

[11] Hollander, J. E., & Carr, B. G. (2020). Virtually perfect? Telemedicine for Covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(18), 1679–1681. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2003539

[12] Hollnagel, E. (2014). Safety-I and Safety-II: The past and future of safety management. Ashgate.

[13] Institute of Medicine. (2012). Health IT and patient safety: Building safer systems for better care. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/13269

[14] International Organization for Standardization. (2018). ISO 31000:2018 Risk management — Guidelines. ISO.

[15] International Organization for Standardization. (2019). ISO 22301:2019 Security and resilience — Business continuity management systems — Requirements. ISO.

[16] Interprofessional Education Collaborative. (2016). Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice: 2016 update. IPEC.

[17] Kaplan, R. S., & Mikes, A. (2012). Managing risks: A new framework. Harvard Business Review, 90(6), 48–60.

[18] Keesara, S., Jonas, A., & Schulman, K. (2020). Covid-19 and health care's digital revolution. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(23), e82. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2005835

[19] Kruk, M. E., Myers, M., Varpilah, S. T., & Dahn, B. T. (2015). What is a resilient health system? Lessons from Ebola. The Lancet, 385(9980), 1910–1912. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60755-3

[20] Mandel, J. C., Kreda, D. A., Mandl, K. D., Kohane, I. S., & Ramoni, R. B. (2016). SMART on FHIR: A standards-based, interoperable apps platform for electronic health records. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 23(5), 899–908. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocv189

[21] Ministry of Health. (2017). The new Model of Care. Ministry of Health, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

[22] National Cybersecurity Authority. (2018). Essential Cybersecurity Controls (ECC-1:2018). Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

[23] Neprash, H. T., McGlave, C. C., Cross, D. A., Virnig, B. A., Puskarich, M. A., Huling, J. D., Rozenshtein, A. Z., & Nikpay, S. S. (2022). Trends in ransomware attacks on US hospitals, clinics, and other health care delivery organizations, 2016–2021. JAMA Health Forum, 3(12), e224873. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.4873

[24] Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447–453. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342

[25] Peerally, M. F., Carr, S., Waring, J., & Dixon-Woods, M. (2017). The problem with root cause analysis. BMJ Quality & Safety, 26(5), 417–422. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2016-005511

[26] Pronovost, P., Needham, D., Berenholtz, S., Sinopoli, D., Chu, H., Cosgrove, S., et al. (2006). An intervention to decrease catheter-related bloodstream infections in the ICU. New England Journal of Medicine, 355(26), 2725–2732. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa061115

[27] Rajkomar, A., Dean, J., & Kohane, I. (2019). Machine learning in medicine. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(14), 1347–1358. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1814259

[28] Reason, J. (2000). Human error: Models and management. BMJ, 320(7237), 768–770. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.320.7237.768

[29] Reeves, S., Pelone, F., Harrison, R., Goldman, J., & Zwarenstein, M. (2017). Interprofessional collaboration to improve professional practice and healthcare outcomes. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 6, CD000072. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000072.pub3

[30] Rosen, M. A., DiazGranados, D., Dietz, A. S., Benishek, L. E., Thompson, D., Pronovost, P. J., & Weaver, S. J. (2018). Teamwork in healthcare: Key discoveries enabling safer, high-quality care. American Psychologist, 73(4), 433–450. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000298

[31] Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority. (2023a). Personal Data Protection Law. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

[32] Saudi Data and Artificial Intelligence Authority. (2023b). AI ethics principles. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

[33] Shanafelt, T., Ripp, J., & Trockel, M. (2020). Understanding and addressing sources of anxiety among health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA, 323(21), 2133–2134. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.5893

[34] Sittig, D. F., & Singh, H. (2010). A new sociotechnical model for studying health information technology in complex adaptive healthcare systems. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 19(Suppl. 3), i68–i74. https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2010.042085

[35] Thomas, S., Sagan, A., Larkin, J., Cylus, J., Figueras, J., & Karanikolos, M. (2020). Strengthening health systems resilience: Key concepts and strategies (Policy Brief 36). European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies.

[36] Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine, 25(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7

[37] Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). Managing the unexpected: Sustained performance in a complex world (3rd ed.). Wiley.

[38] Wong, A., Otles, E., Donnelly, J. P., Krumm, A., McCullough, J., DeTroyer-Cooley, O., et al. (2021). External validation of a widely implemented proprietary sepsis prediction model in hospitalized patients. JAMA Internal Medicine, 181(8), 1065–1070. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.2626

[39] World Health Organization. (2008). Task shifting: Rational redistribution of tasks among health workforce teams: Global recommendations and guidelines. WHO.

[40] World Health Organization. (2010). Framework for action on interprofessional education and collaborative practice. WHO.

[41] World Health Organization. (2016). Global strategy on human resources for health: Workforce 2030. WHO.

[42] World Health Organization. (2021a). Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: WHO guidance. WHO.

[43] World Health Organization. (2021b). Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025. WHO.

[44] Wynants, L., Van Calster, B., Collins, G. S., Riley, R. D., Heinze, G., Schuit, E., et al. (2020). Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19: Systematic review and critical appraisal. BMJ, 369, m1328. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1328