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The Basic Story Line

1. Implementing a multisectoral nutrition policy/plan/program is a complex undertaking that faces many challenges at individual, organizational and system levels

2. Formal governance or coordinating structures (e.g., multisectoral nutrition committees, multistakeholder platforms) often struggle to address these

3. Formal nutrition information platforms (e.g., analysis of existing statistical data, programmatic M&E) are not designed to address most of these

4. “Knowledge brokering” is a practical strategy to more effectively link information with structures in order to address implementation challenges
The Logic of Formal Multisectoral Nutrition

Multisectoral Nutrition Plan, Strategy or Policy

Multisectoral Nutrition Structures
- National
- Sub-National

Functional Multisectoral Nutrition Structures
- National
- Sub-National

Nutrition-Specific & Nutrition-Sensitive Actions
- National
- Sub-National

“Implementation”
1. Challenges
Organizational Level Challenges (vary across countries) (org mandates, commitments and bureaucracy)

- lack of alignment between sectoral objectives and nutrition objectives;
- weak understanding of how to align sectoral mandates and funding priorities with nutrition;
- unawareness by sectors of their contribution to nutrition;
- sector-specific indicators and planning with no common framework;
- nutrition objectives in national development plans but with weak or no indicators, strategies and funding;
- getting sectors to become nutrition-sensitive;
- sectoral focal points that are low-level, different from one meeting to another and unable to influence their ministry;
- over-reliance on sectoral focal points to stimulate and guide nutrition sensitivity;
- lack of nutrition in job descriptions and/or poor specificity;
- high staff turn-over in key positions;
- funding levels, sources, dynamics, inflexibility and unpredictability;
- bureaucratic inefficiencies with funding, and with organizing small and large meetings.
**System Level Challenges** (vary across countries)
(multiple challenges with weak capacities to identify and address them)

- coordination structures weak or not in place;
- platform meetings at all levels with poor attendance, frequency, facilitation and follow-up;
- scheduling conflicts, too many mtgs, too few staff
- time required for structures to become functional or sectors to understand, commit and be accountable
- lack of clear roles and responsibilities for staff and structures;
- disagreements over anchorage /weak convening power and authority for MSN in MOH, MOA, etc.;
- health focus of the nutrition operational agenda;
- non-inclusive process in developing key plans, strategies;
- lack of a shared long-term vision for MSN

- weak cascading approaches and weak or no detailed implementation guidelines;
- weak reporting mechanisms for MSN from districts to national level;
- lack of a real commitment to country-owned, country-led / govt not yet in the driver’s seat
- weak partner alignment
- excessive influence of donors on govt agendas and priorities
Individual Level **Challenges** (capacities and micro-politics)

- weak understanding of MSN or MSN challenges
- weak understanding of how to align sectoral mandates and funding priorities with nutrition;
- overcommitted staff in some key positions
- gate keepers as bottlenecks;
- risk aversion by selected influential actors;
- fear of loss of control over nutrition agenda;
- resistance from some actors within govt and some donors;
- micro-politics, power struggles and personal agendas;
Key Point Re. Challenges:
Challenges are many, varied, dispersed and highly contextual, and are not captured in routine administrative or statistical data.
2. Structures
A “Built Out” Multisectoral Nutrition System Centered on Government Structures

(Δ = focal points) (arrows represent formal information flow)
Complexity in National Nutrition Ecosystems

Informal Governance Processes

Source: www.transformnutrition.org/
Complexity of Actual Working Relationships in Four Asian Countries (MYCNSIA)

IYCF = infant and young child feeding

DNSO = district nutrition security officer

MSNP = multisectoral nutrition program

NSMP = nutrition security maternity protection
Key Point Re. Structures:
Formal structures presume centralized coordination but stakeholder dynamics remain dispersed and heavily influenced by their organizational mandates, interests, incentives and relationships.
3. Information
Three Categories of Implementation Knowledge

CKE: Contextual Knowledge and Experience (often tacit)

The knowledge and experience of actors in a given country used in everyday decision when planning and implementing programs, including:
- Stakeholder relations, histories and dynamics,
- Capacity strengths and weaknesses,
- What has or has not worked, where, when, how, why
- Formal and informal administrative procedures, etc.

CIR: Contextual Implementation Research

Practical inquiries embedded in and connected to implementation in a given country, such as:
- Analysis of existing data
- Formative research,
- Stakeholder analysis,
- Opinion leader research,
- Rapid assessments,
- Operations research,
- Special studies,
- Process evaluation,
- Costing studies,
- Delphi studies,
- Various forms of quality improvement or quality assurance, etc.

GKE: Global Knowledge and Experience

Published or unpublished findings, frameworks, tools and guidelines from:
- Implementation research in other countries
- Implementation experience in other countries
Key Point Re. Information:
Statistical and routine administrative data are useful for some purposes but a much wider range of information, knowledge and experience is needed to assess and address the highly varied MSN implementation challenges
4. Knowledge Brokering
Knowledge Brokering as an Accelerator of Multisectoral Nutrition

CAPACITY BUILDING
Collaborative development and implementation of a knowledge brokering program to promote research use in Burkina Faso, West Africa
Christian Dagenais¹, Téléphone D. Somé², Michèle Boileau-Falardeau¹, Esther McSween-Cadieux¹ and Valéry Ridde³

Using knowledge brokering to promote evidence-based policy-making: the need for support structures
Jessika van Kammen, Don de Savigny & Nelson Sewankambo

Do we need "more research" or better implementation through knowledge brokering?

Knowledge brokering: Exploring the process of transferring knowledge into action
Vicky L. Ward¹, Allan O House¹ and Susan Hamer²

Moving knowledge into action for more effective practice, programmes and policy: protocol for a research programme on integrated knowledge translation
Ian D. Graham¹, Anita Kochar², Chris McCutcheon³ and On behalf of the Integrated Knowledge Translation Research Network Project Leads

Exploring the function and effectiveness of knowledge brokers as facilitators of knowledge translation in health-related settings: a systematic review and thematic analysis
Catherine C. Bornbaum¹,², Kathy Kornas¹, Leslea Peirson⁴ and Laura C. Rosella¹,³,⁵
Knowledge Brokering **Teams** in Multisectoral Nutrition

Small groups of strategically placed staff from different organizations who (in addition to their formal mandates) work informally to:

1. Clarify the routine and ad hoc information needs of decision makers in an organization or system (incl. challenges and opportunities)
2. Identify relevant sources of information or ways to acquire it in order to address those needs
3. Facilitate the access, discussion, interpretation and use of information in decision making
4. Focus on the whole system, not just their portion of it

Examples of potential KB team members (varies by country):

- Govt technical focal points
- REACH facilitators
- NIPN policy advisors
- Engaged researchers or academics
- Well-networked UN actors
- Sub-national actors
A National Nutrition Ecosystem with Knowledge Brokers

Source: www.transformnutrition.org/
Knowledge Brokering to Address Implementation Challenges

- 3 step process
- 3 forms of knowledge
- 3 groups of stakeholders

CKE = contextual knowledge and experience
CIR = contextual implementation research
GKE = global knowledge and experience
Knowledge Brokering to Address Implementation Challenges

- 3 step process
- 3 forms of knowledge
- 3 groups of stakeholders

CEK = contextual knowledge and experience
CIR = contextual implementation research
GKE = global knowledge and experience
A “Built Out” Multisectoral Nutrition System Centered on Government Structures

(Δ = govt focal points)
(arrows represent formal information flow)
(KB represents some points for informal information flow)
Key Points Re. Knowledge Brokering:

Knowledge brokering is uniquely able to identify system-wide implementation challenges in real-time, locate knowledge and experience on how to address them and enhance the effectiveness of the formal multisectoral governance structures.

It capitalizes on the extensive knowledge, experience and relationships among selected actors already embedded in the system.
Overall Key Points

1. Multisectoral nutrition is a complex system with many organizations and stakeholders, little or no centralized control, a wide variety of implementation challenges and very high information requirements.

2. This hinders the ability of the formal governance structures to fulfill their mandates to coordinate and support the system.

3. Knowledge brokering is a practical strategy to link information with the formal structures in order to address implementation challenges and fulfill the promise of multisectoral nutrition.
Thank You
Knowledge Brokers in Multisectoral Nutrition

Roles
1. Clarify the routine and ad hoc information needs of decision makers in an organization or system
2. Identify relevant sources of information or ways to acquire information to address those needs
3. Facilitate the access, discussion, interpretation and use of information in decision making

Requirements, Skills and Attributes
1. Institutionally connected to decision makers and expected to facilitate their work
2. Well-versed in the program’s routine and/or emergent implementation challenges
3. Well-networked with and/or access to program staff and stakeholders
4. Knowledge of existing sources of information and/or ways to acquire it
5. Well-networked with researchers and/or other knowledge experts
6. Strong inter-personal, networking and communication skills
Nearly 50 knowledge-providing organizations and initiatives

People specifically tasked with accessing and adapting knowledge to meet the needs of implementers, planners and policy makers

Practical, timely, impactful assessments, inquiries and special studies to improve implementation

Table 1

Fit-for-purpose tools to address common SUN implementation challenges

Table 2

CSOs, UNN, REACH, Business Alliances, GAIN, Researchers and Academics

Table 3

Table 4

Table 5