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What does it take for nutrition policy to succeed?

Steps 1-3
Completed as part of initial UNAP roll-out

Steps 4-6
Critical for successful implementation, institutionalization and scale up of UNAP

Steps 7-8
Necessary to learn and improve the next round of the UNAP

Engagement and Coordination
Functional capacities for coordination and effective scaling up of nutrition in action

Policy & budget cycle management

Policy Review

Strategic Planning

Cost Estimation

Prioritization

Budget Formulation

Budget Execution

Accounting & Monitoring

Graphic adapted from: SUN Movement, 2015
SPRING PBN Study’s Hypothesis

NNAPs will improve prioritization of nutrition, which will then increase funding for nutrition.
PBN Study Questions

Understanding of UNAP
What is the official plan for reaching undernutrition reduction goals? How well is it understood by stakeholders responsible for prioritizing and funding nutrition activities?

Prioritization
How are priority nutrition activities chosen and planned for under the NNAP?

Financing
How are resources mobilized for these activities? How much is allocated?

Change
How do the priorities and funding change over time and what drives that change?
PBN Study Essentials

- **Mixed Method**
  - conducted and analyzed key informant interviews, news content, analyzed budget data, and secondary survey data

- **Longitudinal**
  - collected data over two+ years

- **Multi-level**
  - collected data at the national level and in districts

- **Based on NNAP**
  - all parameters of the study defined directly by NNAP
PBN Study Key Informants

Key stakeholder groups

- Government
- Donors
- UN Groups
- Civil Society
- Academia
- Private Sector
Funding Analysis, by On- and Off-Budget Funding

Estimated cost of nutrition plan for 2013/14 (Source: UNAP, MSNP)
Funding Analysis, by Sector and Source

- **Agriculture**
  - On-Budget Government: Large portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Medium portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Small portion

- **Education**
  - On-Budget Government: Medium portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Large portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Small portion

- **Health**
  - On-Budget Government: Medium portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Medium portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Small portion

- **Local**
  - On-Budget Government: Large portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Small portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Very small portion

- **Trade**
  - On-Budget Government: Medium portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Medium portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Very small portion

- **Gender**
  - On-Budget Government: Very small portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Small portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Very small portion

- **Water**
  - On-Budget Government: Very small portion
  - On-Budget Donor: Small portion
  - Off-Budget Donor: Very small portion
Funding Analysis, by Sectors

UGANDA, FY 2013/14

- National (off-budget):
  - Agriculture: 4%
  - Health: 85%
  - Other: 11%

- National (on-budget):
  - Agriculture: 43%
  - Health: 15%
  - Other: 42%
Funding Analysis over Time

- Country 1
- Country 2
COUNTRY EXAMPLE: UGANDA

Results show that UNAP has played an important role in catalyzing planning and financing for nutrition.
While there are increased efforts within the sector ministries and government planning agencies to find ways to increase Funding for Nutrition, this has not yet affected the budget - allocations for nutrition were flat between 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Understanding of UNAP and knowledge of key nutrition messages has increased across nearly all stakeholder groups. Positive change (in perceptions, behaviors, and structures) was also seen in Kisoro and Lira due to UNAP rollout.

The UNAP has contributed to improved perceptions and behaviors of government, donor and UN groups related to Prioritization of Nutrition (particularly within Agriculture, Gender, Health, and in Kisoro & Lira). While there were anecdotal increases in planned nutrition activities, no systematic increases in planned activities were found across UNAP stakeholders nationally.

Drivers of Change in Prioritization and Funding include:
• Identity
• Coordination
• Human Resources
• Advocacy
• Adaptation to Local Need
• Sustainable Planning Structures

UNAP has made most progress in positively affecting coordination, advocacy, and adaptation to local need.
Recommendations

#1 Take the long view of scale up

#2 Coordination is not easy. Consider alliances across stakeholder platforms

#3 Increase government financial resources for domestic nutrition human resources and UNAP support structures

#4 Cultivate mix of high-level, mid-level, and grassroots advocates to champion the cause

#5 Strengthen communication between nutrition focal points and planning offices
Recommendations

Translate momentum for nutrition created by the UNAP into more funding

#6 Consider options to institutionalize funding for nutrition

#7 Improve bottom up planning processes to better meet needs at local level

#8 External Partners should align planned activities and funding to UNAP objectives

#9 Approve and Implement the UNAP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework as soon as possible

#10 Place nutrition in each sector’s investment and development plans
Institutionalizing funding streams for nutrition:
Sustainable nutrition financing systems

1. **COSTING**
   - Estimation of funding needed to implement nutrition activities.
   - Serves as the first step in understanding the overall resources required to support nutrition in a country.
   - Without estimated costs of an intervention, governments can’t properly advocate for funds.

2. **BUDGET ANALYSIS**
   - Estimation of funding allocated to implement nutrition activities.
   - Provides insight into where to budget for nutrition within ministerial budget line-items.
   - Without money committed on paper for nutrition, activities will not be included in work plans.

3. **EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS**
   - Estimates what percentage of allocated funds was actually spent.
   - Suggests where capacity to implement nutrition interventions and track expenditures may need to be strengthened.
   - Without funding line-items and actually spending money, governments can’t implement interventions.

4. **EXPENDITURE TRACKING**
   - Helps determine why funds did not reach their intended destination.
   - Tools like the World Bank’s Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS) can do this type of analysis.
   - Without knowing where bottlenecks occur, stakeholders can’t improve funding systems.

**SPRING’S UNIQUE APPROACH TO BUDGET ANALYSIS**

- SPRING and our country partners are using a multi-sectoral, systems strengthening approach to analyze budget allocations for nutrition.
- Where data are available, SPRING is also analyzing disparities between what is allocated and what is spent, and why this occurs.
- When utilized by policymakers, this work can improve advocacy for nutrition, increase funding transparency, and facilitate negotiations for aligning donor and government funding.
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