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A few rules of order

- Turn OFF your microphone and camera
- Please ask questions using the chat box
- Identify yourself when speaking or sending a chat message
- The webinar is being recorded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (CEST)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 09:10</td>
<td>Introduction of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:10 - 09:15</td>
<td>Overview of objectives of the webinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 - 09:45</td>
<td>Guatemala: Utilization of evidence generated by NIPN to influence Nutrition Policies, Strategies and Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45 - 10:20</td>
<td>Discussion of country teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 - 10:30</td>
<td>Conclusions and potential next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What are the options and opportunities to utilize evidence created by NIPN to influence Nutrition Policies, Strategies or Action Plans?

2. What are the challenges?

3. What is required to influence Nutrition Policies, Strategies or Action Plans?
ANALYSIS OF THE INDICATORS OF THE COMMON CADRE OF THE NATIONAL PLAN Multisectoriel OF NUTRITION 2016-2020 IN IVORY COAST

- Assemian Arthur, Senior Strategic Information Advisor, PNMIN, CI
AGENDA

• Introduction

• Process for the development of the Joint Monitoring Framework Evaluation of the National Multisectoral Nutrition Plan (NMNP) 2016-2020

• Analysis of the common monitoring framework assessed by the National Multisectoral Information Platform for Nutrition (PNMIN)

• Lessons learned
Introduction

• Ivory Coast is committed to nutrition
• Joined the Global Scaling-Up Nutrition Movement (SUN) in June 2013
• National Council for Nutrition (CNN) was established in July 2014
• Development and approval in May 2016 of the National Multisectoral Nutrition Plan 2016-2020 (NMNP 2016-2020)
• Registering nutrition investments as a priority for the Public Investment Program (PIP)
• Significant increase in the budget for nutrition.
Introduction

• PNMN 2016-2020 has seven strategic axes:

• **Axis 1**: promoting good nutritional practices and preventive measures;

• **Axis 2**: promoting the management of malnutrition;

• **Axis 3**: sustainable increase in the availability and access to nutritious and diverse food in areas with high prevalence of malnutrition;

• **Axis 4**: Strengthening food safety;
Introduction

- **Axis 5:** Building resilience to food and nutrition crises;

- **Axis 6:** improving hygiene and access to clean water and sanitation in areas with high prevalence of malnutrition;

- **Axis 7:** establishing a nutrition-friendly environment and strengthening nutrition governance.
Introduction

• The National Multisectoral Nutrition Information Platform (PNMIN) is an integral part of the implementation of the 2016-2020 NMNP

• Particularly in its strategic axis 7, through the implementation of a centralized and integrated multi-sector monitoring and evaluation system.
Introduction

• To monitor the evaluation of the 2016-2020 NMNP, a Common Results Framework has been developed around the seven (7) strategic outcomes.
• For each strategic outcome the interventions were identified as well as the departments responsible for their implementation.
• This resulted in a list of 150 consensual NMNP tracking indicators extracted from the Common Results Framework to establish a Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.
Introduction

• One of the first tasks that PNMIN carried out was to review this list of 150 CCES indicators in order to begin the centralization of the data related to it.
• To do so, it was necessary to do so:
• Assess whether the 150 indicators covered all aspects of UNICEF’s conceptual framework for malnutrition,
• Check the availability not only of these indicators themselves (availability within sector departments), but also verify the availability of data.
Process to work out the common monitoring framework for NMNP 2016-2020

• Start: end of 2017, completed: November 2018

• Two steps:

• First step supported by the World Bank, from the end of 2017 to May 2018;

• Second stage supported by UNICEF, from August to November 2018.
Process to work out the common monitoring framework for NMNP 2016-2020

• **First step**
  • Consultants recruited by the World Bank and SE-CONNAPE
  • Based on the Common Results Framework
  • Identify key indicators for each policy outcome and the departments responsible for tracking these indicators
  • Meetings with the monitoring and evaluation of departments to find consensus on indicators and determine data collection mechanisms
  • This information is consolidated in a common monitoring framework
  • Workshop to validate the evaluation tracking manual including the common monitoring framework and the data collection process with all stakeholders.
Process to work out the common monitoring framework for NMNP 2016-2020

• The workshop failed to achieve its objectives due to the questioning of the elements included in the common framework of results
• After the workshop there was still work to be done;
• The refinement of the data and the validation of the common monitoring framework indicators;
• Finalizing the indicator trackers and;
• validation and dissemination of the NMNP Monitoring and Evaluation Operational Manual
Process to work out the common monitoring framework for NMNP 2016-2020

- Second step

- Another consultant was recruited in August 2018 by UNICEF to finalize this work

- Meeting with SE-CONNAPE and sector ministries

- Common monitoring framework validation workshop in November 2018 with all stakeholders
Common Monitoring Framework Analysis- Goals

• **General objective:**

• Have a list of operational and consistent indicators for monitoring the 2016-2020 NMNP.

• **Specific objectives:**

• Verify that all areas of the concept framework for malnutrition are taken into account in the choice of indicators;

• Ensure the availability of NMNP NSC indicators within sectoral monitoring and evaluation systems;

• To ensure the availability of data on sector indicators in the common monitoring framework.
ANALYSIS of COMMON MONITORING FRAMEWORK - Methodology

• Mixed approach

• Qualitative and quantitative

• Two steps:

  • First step:

    • Documentary analysis

    • Interviews with key informants from the donor sectors

    • Comparison between common monitoring framework indicators and those usually followed by departments
Second step:

Data collection and harmonization workshop with all departments contributing to the common monitoring framework.
RESULTS

• Concordance between the indicators present in the common monitoring framework and the areas of the conceptual framework for malnutrition

• Immediate causes of malnutrition: The common monitoring framework does not include morbidity indicators for children aged 0 to 5 years. Example: prevalence of malaria, diarrhea etc.

• Underlying causes: the common monitoring framework does not include indicators on access and coverage of maternal and child care (e.g., NPC coverage rate, etc.) and indicators on educational attainableness

• Root causes: the common monitoring framework does not present indicators on living conditions and household poverty levels.
RESULTS

• Availability of common monitoring framework indicators

• Of the 150 common monitoring framework indicators:
  
  • 35 are directly tracked by SE-CONNAPE and 115 are reported by 10 sectors.
  
  • The 35 indicators tracked by the STP-CNN (former SE-CONNAPE) are all updated and collected by SE-CONNAPE and there are no problems with matching or data availability.
RESULTS

• Availability of common monitoring framework indicators

• Of the 115 indicators that sectors need to provide for the common monitoring framework:

• 51, or 44.34%, are not provided.

• In fact, three (03) departments have the largest number of indicators not currently informed.

• These include the Ministry of Health and Public Hygiene (16 indicators), the Ministry of Animal and Fisheries Resources (11 indicators) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (11 indicators).
RESULTS: Types of indicators not informed

- Impact; 6%
- effet; 25%
- extrants; 69%
RESULTS: Sources of indicators not informed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INDICATORS</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDS-MICS</td>
<td>4 à 5 ans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic survey</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/assessment</td>
<td>Annual/variable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS: Why indicators are not informed

- Many reasons, the most frequent:
- Indicator not listed in departments;
- The activity related to the indicator has not yet been carried out;
- Need to conduct a survey to inform the informer
### RESULTS: consequences for monitoring NMNP indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Axis</th>
<th>Number of indicators by strategic axis</th>
<th>Number of Indicators Not Informed by Strategic Axis</th>
<th>Relative frequency of indicators not information by strategic axis in percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis 7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSONS LEARNED

• The main lesson learned from this work is the selection of indicators as part of the development of a common framework for monitoring the evaluation of a multi-sector plan.

• We have learned that in this context, the focus should be on indicators that are already available and regularly monitored in the sectors involved in the implementation of the multi-sector plan.

• However, in the event that new indicators are produced, it is essential to find the additional resources for collecting the data necessary to calculate them.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION
USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC POLICIES
1. SIMSAN as a platform for the presentation of data and information.

2. Evolution of strategies for reducing chronic malnutrition: findings, recommendations and use.

3. Capacity building in governance and monitoring.

4. Communication of processes for decision making.
NATIONAL CONTEXT

Política Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional
Ley del Sistema Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional
Reglamento de la Ley del Sistema Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional

2020-2024

Cruzada Nacional por la Nutrición
DECISION MAKERS

NATIONALLY

• National Food and Nutrition Security Council (CONASAN)
• Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security

LOCALLY

• Departmental Commission on Food and Nutrition Safety (CODESAN).
• Food Safety and Nutrition Commission (COMUNSAN).
• Community Food and Nutrition Safety Commissions (COCOSAN).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline / National Strategies</th>
<th>Prevalence of chronic malnutrition and goals.</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENSMI (NSO)</td>
<td>46.5% (children &lt; 5 years) 41.7% (children &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Development Plan “K’atun: nuestra Guatemala 2032”</td>
<td>Reduce at least 25 percentage points. 21.5%</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td>Reducing the prevalence of chronic malnutrition by 22 percent 24.5%</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Malnutrition Prevention Strategy</td>
<td>Reduce the prevalence of chronic malnutrition by 10 percentage points (children 2 years old)</td>
<td>2016 - 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great National Crusade for Nutrition</td>
<td>Reduce 7 percentage points in children under 5 years of age.</td>
<td>2020 - 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN Municipal Policy</td>
<td>Reduce 50% of chronic malnutrition (Situation at the municipal level 70% of chronic malnutrition). 61.5% chronic malnutrition (with administrative data – SIMSAN).</td>
<td>Policy update in 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Use of routine data for decision-making
• Municipal Commission on Food and Nutrition Safety (COMUSANNA)
• http://simsan.org.gt/
EVOLUTION OF THE STRATEGIES OF REDUCING CHRONIC MALNUTRITION IN GUATEMALA
SOCIALIZATION OF THE CASE STUDY: EXPERIENCES

National Food Safety System

Meeting for the design of the Great National Crusade for Nutrition (continues)

Used as a reference for projections of national targets achievements and instruments of medium- and long-term state interventions

Evidence for the operation of the National Food Security System (multisectoral and budget planning)
PREVALENCE OF CHRONIC MALNUTRITION ACCORDING TO ENSMI AND EXPECTED AND REQUIRED TRENDS TO REACH NATIONAL TARGETS BY 2030 AND 2032

Fuente: elaborado en base a documentos
• The rate of reduction in chronic malnutrition over the past 20 years is 0.45%.
• Strategic interventions address immediate and some underlying causes.

• The design of the strategies is consistent with international recommendations.
• Strategies have not led to a substantial increase in the way in addressing the problem of chronic malnutrition.
CAPACITY BUILDING IN GOVERNANCE AND MONITORING
COORDINATION MECHANISMS

Nutrition Cluster

Consultation and Social Participation Instance – INCOPAS-

Steering Committee
FSN MUNICIPAL PUBLIC POLICY

Definition and updating of municipal indicators and targets based on SIMSAN data.
MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM AND MUNICIPAL PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GCNN

Monitoring and evaluation system

Municipal Plan for the implementation of the Great National Crusade for Nutrition
SOCIALIZING RESULTS

Playful awareness, information and advocacy tools adapted to different audiences
AWARENESS-RAISING AND INFORMATION CAMPAIGN IN THE FRAMEWORK OF COVID-19
### Challenges

#### SIMSAN
- Moving forward with the data system open.
- Scale experiences to other municipalities, mainly the experience of using administrative data.
- The institutionalization of the platform (Municipal, Departmental and National).
- Strengthen the capabilities of technical teams in data analysis, for an approximate period of 2 years. Permanent staff.

#### Strategies
- Use of administrative data for decision-making from the municipal, departmental level.
- Que la nueva estrategia logre la reducción deseada mejorando la implementación, mayor asignación presupuestaria y estabilidad.

#### Governance
- Moving towards decentralization of planning and budgeting.
- Sustainability of strategic processes.

#### Communication
- Disseminated quality information materials to guide decision-making in chronic malnutrition reduction interventions.
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DISCUSSION
CONCLUSIONS & NEXT STEPS
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