

Nutrition Financing Community of Practice Meeting Q1 2021

March 30, 2021 (3pm-4pm CET)

Note that:

- The agenda and presentations will be sent alongside the minutes.
- The recording of the session is available through the link below:
 - https://zoom.us/rec/share/zhU6Oco0f4pVfhnNa93xF2GIhXJuBcS79fponihMr4yCxMwuNuKd8i2KFp_vAuYq.zrd5BALpiEP-2zY7
 - **Access Passcode: +ZxB0y6U**
- All background and materials on the Nutrition Financing COP will be available on the SUN Movement website. You can access them through the following link: <https://scalingupnutrition.org/share-learn/mobilise-advocate-and-communicate-for-impact/community-of-practice-on-nutrition-financing/>

Participants: 52 participants

Ali Subandoro (World Bank/Global Financing Facility), Kyoko Okamura (World Bank), Andi Kendle, Anne Marie Hoog, Anne Walsh (the Power of Nutrition), Ann-Marie Quin (SUN Movement Secretariat), Augustin Flory (Results for Development), Barbara Koloshuk, Brooke Detwiler, Charlotte Martineau (Global Nutrition Report), Danielle Serebro (Collaborative African Budget Reform Initiative), Debora Di Dio (SUN Movement Secretariat), Diasso Dieudonne (CILSS), Dylan Walters (Nutrition International), El Hadji Gueye (Action Contre la Faim), Elaine Gray (USAID), Emily Heneghan Kasoma (WFP – SUN Business Network), Farai Manwa (SUN Movement Secretariat), Felicity, Florence Tonnoir (UN Nutrition), Helen Connolly, Helene Berton (EU), Hugh Bagnol Oakeley (Save the Children), Jane Keylock (Nutrition works - TASC Team), Jean Sebastien KOUASSI (SUN Movement Secretariat), Kefilwe Moalosi (NEPAD/AUDA), Kristin Hall (Power of Nutrition), Kristina Pitsyna (UNITLIFE), Geoffrey Lairumbi (AfDB/African Leaders for Nutrition), Laurent Michiels (UN Nutrition), Marie Durling (WFP), Marta Santoboni, Mary d'Alimonte (Results for Development), Michelle Thompson (Power of Nutrition), Myriam Hebabi (Nutrition International), Noreen Mucha, Noreen Prendiville, Chigahiro Nyasha (SUN Secretariat), Osob Osman, Paula Quigley (TASC Team), Peter Nicholas (Social Finance), Rebekah Pinto (USAID), Rita Abi Akar, Sabine Kiefer (Swiss Tropical And Public Health Institute- SUN Donor Network), Sam Ashby (Development Initiatives), San Njona (SUN Movement Secretariat), Sandrine Fimbi (PATH), Sascha Lamstein (USAID), Silvia Kaufman, Tamsin Walters (TASC)

Presentations (see attached slides for reference)

Quick introduction : Jean Sebastien KOUASSI - Country finance Specialist - SUN Secretariat

- This is the Second call of the COP the first one was in December 2020.
- The COP will maintain quarterly calls with the next call being in June 2021.
- The 2021 N4G and FSS will be milestones for the Movement.

1st presentation – World Bank/Global Financing Facility: ‘ Strengthening Accountability for Nutrition Results through improved PFM’

Kyoko Shibata Okamura - Nutrition Specialist - World Bank

- The Bank has been co-chairing the Financing working group in preparation for the N4G summit in December. Commitment making should go beyond the summit and accountability is the key for resource allocation spending and the results.
- The World Bank contributes to the “more \$ for nutrition” mantra, mainly through continued growth in IDA/IBRD, in which catalytic financing mechanisms, such as GFF and The Power of Nutrition, play a critical role in advancing policy dialogue on the value of nutrition as an investment that will provide a good return.
- Wb is supporting is also supporting the other mantra of “more nutrition for the \$ spent”, including the area of domestic financing for nutrition. We have been working on strengthening evidence-based planning and resource allocations, financial assessment, and program evaluations in the context of PFM for nutrition.
- Challenges for nutrition accountability
 - Horizontal and vertical systems are needed for good coordination.
 - Measuring and tracking is necessary as countries cannot manage or improve what they do not measure.
 - There is need to think of the ex-ante assessment of the budget, including spending.
 - Invisibility of nutrition expenditures in the money follows functions approach, hence shift to program budgeting.
 - Financial information is not linked to non-financial data.
- To strengthen PFM systems for nutrition we investigate the following elements: strategy and costing in the planning stage; budget formulation and tagging in the budgeting stage; and M&E.

2nd Presentation Indonesia- Integrated Planning and Budgeting for Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Program (StraNas)

Ali Subandoro - Senior Nutrition Specialist - Global Financing Facility/World Bank

- In 2018 Indonesia announced national strategy to accelerate stunting reduction (STRANA). This is a high-level initiative led by the President and Vice President. It commits about 14, 4 billion dollars in domestic resources over 2018 to 2024 with the clear target of reducing stunting from a baseline of 37% in 2014 to 19% in 2024.
- The WB and GFF project called Investing in Nutrition in early years help supporting the implementation of the STRANAs through a series of policy reforms to improve the convergence of nutrition.
- The government has the resources but have not seen good progress. What they need is to improve the efficiency of spending. The ministry of finance and ministry planning has issued budget tagging, tracking and evaluation guidelines to ensure that quality nutrition interventions are included in sectoral plans and are being tracked through financial management information system.
- Budget tagging is tool used to give label in planning and budget document and money platform to identify, track and monitor output of line ministries activities including its budget and spending. The

budget tagging was only executed for the central budget and not for the sub-national budget. This is an ongoing reform and will be extended to the subnational.

- Rwanda is embarking on the similar process as in Indonesia. With the same strategy that promotes the same convergence approach. The government of Rwanda are on an ongoing reform to establish budget tagging and tracking system and institutionalize annual budget review to enhance spending efficiency.

Questions & Answers for the first session

- **Mary D’Alimonte (Results for Development):** Thank you for this helpful context. Can you explain what you mean by integration here? **Answer-** Different sectors have their own system so want to make sure that the sectoral and budget planning are aligned and integrated well.
- **Hugh Bagnall-Oakeley (Save the Children):**
 - The problem with the PBB process is in some cases nutrition is not even cited as a performance indicator. We are having to ask Governments we work with to include a nutrition indicator.
 - In the Indonesia context, it is surely the District context that is important, so rather than the RPJMN, we should be looking at the RPJMD (local district level Medium Term plans). Notwithstanding that in Indonesia there are 21 (or is it 22?) making the policy/strategy adherence at District level complicated. Has the World Bank looked at the nutrition Policy/strategy environment? **Answer:** it is correct that district level budgeting is important given the decentralized system. As part of StraNas and INEY PforR, the districts develop District Convergence Action Plan that includes 8 key steps from diagnostic, programming to monitoring of convergence services. Furthermore, the lack of standardized chart of account creates additional challenges for tagging. The current budget tagging covers only central spending but there are ongoing efforts to include sub-national spending.
 - What is the plan to ensure that N4G is highlighted in the UNFSS? And how will the UNFSS follow on to the N4G?
- **Geoffrey LAIRUMBI (African Development Bank):** What has been your experience linking budget allocation to nutrition outcomes? **Answer:** the main issue is the availability and frequency of nutrition outcomes data. As part of StraNas, the government improve the availability of nutrition outcomes data by conducting annual nutrition survey that includes anthropometric indicators as well as selected priority interventions as a basis for budget evaluation. Another important point is to ensure interoperability of financing and program monitoring data system to enable budget evaluation.
- **Rebekah Pinto (USAID):** Agreed with Hugh's point above, it would be good to understand how the system of tagging and tracking has been adapted (if at all) at the sub-national level given the highly decentralized nature of nutrition decision-making in Indonesia. **Answer:** please see answer above – this is an ongoing process that starts with standardizing chart of account to enable proper tagging and tracking. The current initiative in Indonesia includes national spending. Pakistan is also instituting nutrition budget tagging within their existing IFMIS and CoA where they have a more straightforward system linking the federal and provincial/district level data. They have completed the guidance at the federal level, now moving onto provincial level with an aim to eventually collate the data at different

levels in a coherent manner (i.e., categorizing by nutrition-specific/-sensitive/-relevant, expenditure types, on- and off-budget, sectoral departments, etc.).

- **Noreen Mucha:** It would be good to develop a global guidance on nutrition budget coding categories that somehow align with the DEC nutrition finance codes that foreign aid countries use—Is this in the planning? **Answer:** we are not aware of such initiatives, but this is a good idea. We are working on synthesizing the experiences of countries implementing budget tagging, and budget coding categories could be highlighted.
- **Augustin Flory (R4D)** Congratulations to the government and partners for developing this system. Great to see budget and expenditures tagging. One question: how common is it for the government of Indonesia to use tagging and so how much of a challenge was it to introduce this tagging system? **Answers:** The Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Planning have been able to produce tagging reports on a regular basis and these are included in the disbursement-linked indicators (DLIs) of the WB/GFF project. In 2020, the budget performance review is included in the Budget Note and used to inform the budget allocation of the subsequent years. More needs to be done to improve the quality of budget recommendations. The key factor in introducing the tagging system is the high-level commitment to engage enabling ministries such as Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Planning, supported by the issuance of complementary regulations (i.e., Ministerial Decree) and detailed guidelines to incentivize the implementation. In the case of Pakistan, the introduction of nutrition budget tagging is ongoing, learning from preceding experiences in climate change and poverty expenditure tracking.
- **Silvia Kaufmann:** to Kyoko and Ali: this is so great to see the links happening, wonderful, thank you for sharing. Regarding the non-financial reporting and monitoring: what indicators/information are being tracked to indicate whether actions might have the expected impact on reducing stunting. Lancet 2013 is some good information on impactful interventions, but otherwise, what is a good practice/experience? reporting depends on coverage data?

Answer: The priority interventions in the national plan are mostly aligned with Lancet recommended interventions so the indicators are also mostly aligned. there are several interventions/indicators that are country specific and may not be included in Lancet. We try to leverage DHIS/HMIS for routine monitoring, which of course have its own challenges and therefore likely require a combined use of both routine monitoring data and survey data. Survey data can include more and higher quality outcome data, in addition to coverage data, but the challenge is the frequency and data availability at sub-national levels. For the purpose of linking with financial data from FMIS, it would make more sense to use indicators that are reported at least annually and at the same administrative levels as FMIS.

Updates on Nutrition for Growth and the UN Food systems Summits – SUN Secretariat - Debora Di Dio (Senior Nutrition Strategist)

- SMS is present supporting the government of Japan and the advisory body for the FSS.
- We are following up on the N4g with the government of Japan and other partners.
- Ama and GNR have been present in the push for the Nutrition year of action.
- Here is the [registration link](#) for the N4G roundtable on the 8th of April 2020.
- Linking up N4G and the UN FSS: the SUN Movement has developed a narrative on linking the two summits with different opportunities and steps (see attached document).

2nd presentation: 'the Global Nutrition Report's role in the nutrition year of action' - Charlotte Martineau - Senior Nutrition Policy Analyst – Global Nutrition Report (GNR)

The GNR was conceived following the 2013 N4G summit and produces annual reports with the best available data and there is one chapter focusing on financing every year.

- In the current N4G tracker you will find the latest data on progress made by governments, civil society organizations, UN agencies and other partners. The role of the GNR in the year of action is developing and leading the Nutrition Accountability Framework.
- The key steps for registering commitments:
 - Review the commitment registration guide
 - Formulate SMART commitment(s)
 - Register your commitments(s) online
 - Report your progress
- We need to work towards one Nutrition accountability framework.

Questions & Answer for the second presentation

- **Hugh Bagnall-Oakeley (Save the Children):** Will the GNR accountability tools cover other events (e.g: UNFSS)?

Answer: Yes, therefore we are developing a nutrition accountability Framework for the year of action (not limited to N4G summit) this should enable commitment makers who would want to use other events (like UNFSS) as commitment making moment AND register their commitment in the nutrition accountability framework for long term monitoring.

- **Noreen Mucha:**
 - The nutrition growth commitment tracker is also very interesting and should help to make the codes for foreign aid more clearer as it was still unclear for example US definition of nutrition specific vs nutrition sensitive when it comes to their coding: Programs use a synergistic package of nutrition-specific and sensitive interventions that help decrease chronic and acute malnutrition by improving preventive and curative health services, including: growth monitoring and promotion; water, sanitation and hygiene; immunization; deworming; reproductive health and family planning; and malaria prevention and treatment.
 - Also, will this code be clearer? The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) maintains various code lists which are used by donors to report on and classify their aid flows to the DAC databases. Basic nutrition purpose code: 12240. In terms of consistency across donors?

Answer: The process of tracking commitments is separate, though related to the broader tracking of finance. It is hoped the GNR can make best use of the OECD DAC CRS system (including its revised codes and policy marker) to devise a consensual approach for identifying, assessing, and tracking specific and sensitive finance, building on existing approaches and experiences with the previous SDN methodology, including for the purposes of N4G commitment, and action tracking. This will likely require a joint approach however and should be part of the work of to-be-convened TAWG.

- **Meaza Getachew (FHI360):** Isn't there also a marker for coding indirect nutrition programming?

Answer: Yes, there is. As above this is a separate but related issue. Good tracking requires good data, and good data on indirect or sensitive financing requires reporters to the OECD DAC CRS to appropriate the new policy marker correctly. So far, not all reporters are making full or proper use of these. Experience monitoring other policy markers indicates this should improve over time as reporters familiarize themselves with the guidance and build into their own systems. Exactly how the data is used to estimate sensitive finance is yet to be determined, though the previous SDN approach (which has been shown to largely align with the policy marker in so far as capturing nutrition-sensitive financing) should be a starting point.

- **Judith KABORE (Action Contre la Faim):** at country level, who is supposed to register the commitment online? Only one specific person like the SUN focal point or all the MSP members could also register commitment on behalf of their own agency?

Answer: There is no specific recommendation at this stage regarding who should be registering commitments. Coordination and agreement within an organization or government is highly recommended. The form will require specific details about the commitment making entity: what stakeholder group is the entity part of (national government, ministry or body, UN, donor, private sector...) name of entity, name of authorized representatives and contact details.

- **Silvia Kaufmann (Consultant):** Do we have indication how a future improved donor commitment tracking could look, thinking about a revised nutrition-sensitive DAC codes as well? links between nutrition policy marker and DAC codes?

Answer: The improvements to these existing tools (improved codes and the marker) should benefit the NAF. These are just one part of the puzzle (namely how best to report and derive data on financing levels for defined activities). With regards to how things could improve, we need greater consensus and shared responsibility in this area. Not all donors make use of the OECD DAC CRS systems equally, and besides, the OECD DAC CRS systems is not perfect. In all cases we should look to continually improve the quality and timeliness of finance data and consider how best to make use of that data for tracking and accountability purposes.

- **Elaine Gray (USAID):** @Meaza Getachew and others: USAID Advancing Nutrition is supporting the SUN Donor Network to conduct an ongoing analysis of application of the new nutrition policy marker, including for quantification purposes and framing N4G commitments.

Answer: This is great to hear, GNR is willing to work with the SDN and other partners to share learning, and devise together a best-practice approach for identifying and estimating specific and sensitive finance, which in turn is required to report against any financial commitments. The existing SDN approach could be updated to incorporate these advancements.

AOB, updates from partners and next steps:

Helen Berton (Consultant – EU): Last year the delegation of the EU in Niger has decided to support the government of Niger in mobilizing donors by doing a donor mapping of nutrition intervention. We have consultants in place, and we will be back in touch with power of nutrition and the World Bank.