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Case studies of intersectoral action
INTEGRATION
Bringing together of structures and functions (resources, personnel, strategy and planning) with a merging of sectoral remits

COLLABORATION / PARTNERSHIP
Sharing of some resources or personnel to facilitate strategic joint planning and action on certain issues, while maintaining sectoral remits

COORDINATION / LINKAGE / COOPERATION
Maintaining sectoral remits while working together on certain issues; interactions often unstructured or based on a loose goal-oriented agreement

LINE FUNCTIONNING
Continuing to work in separate sectors with little communication or strategic planning on issues

Harris and Drimie 2012
The study in Burkina Faso

ASSUMPTION: provision of interventions to improve agricultural production, health behavior, and empowerment will create synergies that help to improve nutrition outcomes

PROBLEM: how these synergies occur; it is likely that the form of integrated action chosen, and the assumptions underlying these choices, would affect programs

AIM: to explore experiences of intersectoral integration in HKI’s E-HFP program in Burkina Faso, to provide insight into intersectoral working arrangements from the viewpoint of those working in (or targeted by) this integrated program
How and why did different sectors integrate at different programmatic levels within HKI’s E-HFP program in Burkina Faso?

1. Integration in design
2. Environment for integration
3. Perceptions of integration
4. Implementation of integration
5. Best practices/common challenges
6. Monitoring of integration
7. Modes of integration for service delivery
Guiding framework

- Development priorities
- Urgency
- Environmental context (economic, social, cultural, political, legal)

- Leaders/Champions
- Vision
- Capacity
- Incentives
- Organizational structures, values, cultures, experiences

- Shared understanding
- Roles and accountability
- Participation and partner relations
- Partnership types

Adapted from Garrett and Natalicchio 2012
Program Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HKI- Regional</td>
<td>Agriculture advisors</td>
<td>Health advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI- National</td>
<td>Project manager; Communications officer; M&amp;E officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI- Local</td>
<td>Production officer; Production facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-Local</td>
<td>Agriculture/ livestock agents</td>
<td>Health agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRG</td>
<td>APRG HFP focal point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Model farmers</td>
<td>Health volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  
- Agriculture/livestock  
- Health/nutrition  
- Both
2 Enabling environment

- Malnutrition seen as a development issue locally
- Not mentioned spontaneously
- Issues mentioned were determinants of malnutrition:
  - lack of access to water,
  - farming inputs,
  - health centers,
  - poverty
3 Perceptions of integration

“I didn’t need to work with agents in different sectors to complete my activities.”
- NGO agriculture facilitator

“Working together brings with it certain advantages, such as complementarity and effectiveness.”
- NGO agriculture facilitator

Motivation mixed for intersectoral working
- Knowledge gained in other sectors
- Sense of value placed on the project
- ‘Just doing my job’
Implementation of integration

“No, we never initiated a joint activity together. The Relais [community health workers] did their work, we did ours. There was no confusion between tasks.”

- Model farmer

“Although it wasn’t planned that we worked together, he [co-worker from another sector] came with me on certain trips because of the long distances.”

- NGO health facilitator

Some community-level workers ended up with dual roles

“Playing both roles was difficult because I had a lot of responsibilities, and I didn’t have the means for moving around and making house visits—even though the houses were very far from each other.”

- Community health worker & model farmer
Best practices / challenges

“We would have liked training on ENA much like the nutrition facilitators received. That would have allowed for a certain complementarity on the ground, a certain junction of our activities.”

- NGO agriculture facilitator

- Staff turnover: loss of understanding of the need for integration

- Resources: unequal distribution across sectors at community level was a point of friction
Monitoring of integration

- No formal monitoring of modes of integrated working
- Unclear if and how the Steering Committee aided intersectoral accountability
## Modes of integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Similar targeting?</th>
<th>Harmonized design?</th>
<th>Cross-sectoral training?</th>
<th>Joint implementation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-location</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-training</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓/X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Implementation is by a single cross-trained individual
Typology

1. **Co-location**: Different sectoral programs are implemented in the same place with similar targeting; assumptions of synergy even in the absence of coordinated design.

2. **Coordination**: Design of program elements or messages is harmonized between sectors, but training and implementation are separate.

3. **Collaboration**: Field workers with separate sectoral training come together to implement joint activities within a program (which may or may not be coordinated by design).

4. **Cross-training**: Field workers receive cross-sectoral training for improved understanding, but program elements (coordinated or not) are delivered by each sector separately.

5. **Integration**: Field workers receive cross-training and individuals are expected to deliver coordinated program elements from more than one sector.
Conclusions

- Understanding, confidence, and motivation for cross-sectoral work was high.
- Staff turnover, dual workload, and unbalanced resources across sectors were challenges.
- The goal of harmonized messaging remained from design through into implementation.
- Alternative modes of integration were not elaborated or monitored, leading to varied delivery.
- Several modes of integration were identified → Typology
Lessons going forward

- Pay explicit attention to different modes of integration in program design (strategies / day-to-day processes)
- Use the emerging typology to start to think through appropriate modes in different contexts
- Monitor whether and how these are implemented
- Future research: Build in learning as to which is more useful
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