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• **Strengthen** global & country efforts to **scale up** high impact nutrition practices

• **Prevent** stunting & anemia in the first 1,000 days

• **Link** agriculture & nutrition under Feed the Future

5-year, USAID centrally-funded Cooperative Agreement (Oct 1, 2011 – Sept 30, 2016)
For every $1 spent on nutrition, there is an $18 return in health and economic benefits.
Nepal’s Multi-sector Nutrition Plan (MSNP)


To accelerate the reduction of maternal and child undernutrition in Nepal through multi-sectoral collaboration

Provides an Activity Plan with responsible ministries attached
Results show that the MSNP has played an important role in planning and financing for nutrition.
SPRING’s Pathways to Better Nutrition Study
PBN Study in Nepal

PBN Study Areas
Pathways to Better Nutrition in Nepal

This was a case study on how various nutrition stakeholders in Nepal prioritize and fund activities to reduce malnutrition in the country under the MSNP framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed Method</th>
<th>conducted key informant interviews, scanned news content, analyzed budget data, and reviewed secondary survey data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>collected data over two+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level</td>
<td>collected data at the national level, in districts and village development committees (VDCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on MSNP</td>
<td>all parameters of the study defined directly by the MSNP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Methods
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# Achham Summary of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government sector</th>
<th>Donor agency</th>
<th>UN group</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achham District</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VDC</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does PBN contribute to Nepal?

PBN’s Hypothesis

The MSNP will improve the priority of nutrition across stakeholders, which will then increase funding for nutrition.
SPRING’S PBN STUDY TRACKED:

Policy → Drivers of Change → Prioritization → Funding

BY ASKING THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

Do people understand and use the policy?

How can/does change occur in planning and funding?

What change occurred in planning nutrition activities?

What change occurred in funding nutrition activities?
Achham Study Findings
Understanding of the MSNP was very good among district stakeholders. More should be done to **improve understanding of the MSNP among all VNFSSC members.**
Key aspects that affected the MSNP rollout in Achham were identified.

The MSNP has made the most progress in positively affecting coordination and sustainability.
The MSNP has contributed to improved perceptions and behaviors of government, donor, and UN groups related to prioritization of nutrition. All stakeholders agreed that prioritization for nutrition has increased in their work.
The MSNP has been very successful in prioritizing **funding for nutrition** through a separate line item in the budget.
Achham
DISTRICT SNAPSHOT
## Achham: District Snapshot

### Summary of Key MSNP Indicators for Achham District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicator</th>
<th>Level in Achham District</th>
<th>MSNP National Target (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of primary education$^5$</td>
<td>49.36%</td>
<td>(Increased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunting, children under 5 yrs.$^6$</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underweight, children under 5 yrs.$^6$</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting, children under 5 yrs.$^6$</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Level in Achham District</th>
<th>MSNP National Target (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 IYCF Practices$^7$</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>(Increased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any anemia, children 6-59 months.$^4$</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>(Reduced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any anemia, women of reproductive age$^4$</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>(Reduced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI incidence rate among children under 5 years (per 1000)$^8*$</td>
<td>1924.17</td>
<td>(Reduced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea incidence rate among children under 5 years (per 1000)$^8*$</td>
<td>1424.66</td>
<td>(Reduced)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reduce malnutrition in Achham, KIs said:

• Reduce women’s workload
• Reduce migration of men
• Reduce early marriage rates
• Increase birth spacing
• Reduce alcohol consumption
• Eradicate chaupadi pratha
• Eradicate kufat barne
Understanding the MSNP
District Government KIs

The MSNP was not new, but it was different because:

The MSNP had an integrated approach

“Earlier, only health was involved in nutrition. Now all the sectors are equally involved.”
[Government Stakeholder]

The MSNP targeted Golden Thousand Day mothers

“Nutrition programs are not new. What is new is that we have to include pregnant women and women who have children under the age of two years when forming groups...”
[Government Stakeholder]

The MSNP targeted disadvantaged groups in VDCs
Donors, CSOs, and Private Sector Stakeholders

Donors, CSOs, and Private Sector KIs said: “Multi-sectoral approach is important”

USAID’s Suaahara program is aligned with the MSNP

UNICEF’s CFLG has a multi-sectoral approach

“Working with all six sectors is important for nutrition instead of working with just the Department of Health (DOH) and the district development committee (DDC)”

“Our programs are aligned with the MSNP”

Private sector does not have a clear role in the MSNP
VDC Stakeholders

• Government sector members of the VNFSSC had a good understanding of the MSNP

• Non-government sector members of the VNFSSC did not yet have adequate understanding of the MSNP’s objectives

• But non-government sector members of the VNFSSC said they received good nutrition information from Suaahara’s training
Views on Scale-Up

Limited resources prevented scale-up

“It is not possible to do all over the district. Because the program is of small scale.” [Government Stakeholder]

Scaling-up to more VDCs will make the MSNP more effective

“We have selected only four VDCs but that is not enough...there are many other VDCs with weak nutrition situation...MSNP would be more if we conduct the program in some more VDCs.” [Government stakeholder]

Change Takes Time

“When you build roads, change is clearly visible. But in health, change cannot happen overnight. It takes time. Even sometimes 20 years.” [VDC Stakeholder]
Key Drivers

MSNP

1. Accessibility
2. Human Resources
3. Coordination
4. Bottom-Up Planning
5. Sustainability

Drivers of Change

Positive Change Toward Scaling-Up Nutrition

Nutrition Prioritization

Funding
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Inaccessibility makes it difficult to implement programs

“Behavior change messaging is difficult to conduct when it takes two days to reach the VDC.” [District government stakeholder]
**Human Resources: District Level KIs**

Current HR was insufficient to effectively implement the MSNP

Achham was considered a “least preferred” posting

“*Achham is inaccessible, no official is excited at the prospect of working here.*” [Government stakeholder]

Manpower shortage & frequent staff transfer

“*There is frequent staff transfer. Even if staff retires, it is hard to find a replacement.*” [Government stakeholder]

Overburdened staff & lack of transfer of knowledge about programs

“*Programs are increasing but staff is not.*” [Government stakeholder]

Same people who attended workshops/trainings were transferred by the time of implementation
Human Resources: VDC Level KIs

Current HR was insufficient to effectively implement the MSNP

Migration of men

“80-90% of people in our farmers’ group are women. [Donor stakeholder]

Manpower shortage: Same people served on too many VDC committees or belonged to various community groups

“There are savings groups, farmers group, mothers group. It is a burden to the women” [VDC stakeholder]

Overburdened staff: Too many responsibilities for staff to handle

“Workload is very high.” [VDC stakeholder]
Coordination between sectors was good. DNFSSC met regularly.

“There is no difficulty. Meetings of the nutrition steering committees are frequently conducted every three months.” [Government stakeholder]
Coordination: District Level

Examples of good coordination:

DLSO + WASH = Build cowsheds separate from houses

DADO + DWCDO = Provide nutrition training to female farmers
Coordination: District Level

Large NGO presence made coordination difficult

“There is one NGO at the bottom of the hill, one in the middle of the hill, one at the top of the hill....too much crowding of NGOs...they [NGOs] are finding it difficult to even find places where they can implement...” [Civil society stakeholder]

“It is difficult to coordinate with so many NGOs. Sometimes there is duplication.” [Government stakeholder]
Coordination: VDC Level

VNFSSC was unable to meet regularly

“...we are not able to meet regularly. [The] VDC Secretary is the convener but resides in the district. He has too much to do and is overburdened. Due to lack of time, work load, less interest of people, we don’t meet...”
[VDC stakeholder]
Bottom-up Planning: District and VDC Level

Bottom-up planning broke down in practice

“After plans go to the central level, plans are standardized across districts and budgets are cut.” [District stakeholder]

“Decisions on what to prioritize are made by experts. Community needs are not well understood.” [District stakeholder]

“Plans from VDC, ilaka level are only on paper. They are never implemented.” [VDC stakeholder]
The MSNP has ensured sustainability of nutrition programming in Achham:

- Planning structures created (DNFSSC, VNFSSC)
- Separate budget line item

District and VDC KIs:
If government has ownership, programs are more sustainable than donor programs

“Government programs are for the long run.” [Government stakeholder]

“Donor programs come for only 2-3 years. What can you achieve in that time?” [VDC stakeholder]
Has the MSNP improved prioritization of nutrition in Achham?
Prioritization

The MSNP has contributed to prioritizing nutrition at both district and VDC levels

“There is a policy level decision made in the DDC council that during workplanning and budgeting, sectors should incorporate nutrition in their programs.” [District stakeholder]

“In action plans now, nutrition is very much focused” [VDC stakeholder]
Activity that *has been* prioritized: Raising awareness

Other activities that *should be* prioritized:

- Monitoring
- Identify moderate malnutrition, not just severe cases
- Prevent the sale of expired and contaminated foods
- Encourage consumption of locally grown foods, e.g., *shishnu*

“There should be monitoring so that we can reduce misuse of resources, identify problems, re-plan if necessary and reach the most vulnerable group...”

[District stakeholder]
How were resources mobilized for these activities? How much was allocated? What was the flow of finances?
**Financing: The MSNP Line Item**

“60 million being allocated for the MSNP is the major success...it is good that the money goes directly to the districts.” [National Donor Stakeholder]

**Known Data Gaps:**
- Have not yet collected further data on existing district “regular” budgets used for nutrition activities
- Need to compare the MSNP budget line amount with total district budgets

Source: NNFSSC approved Total MSNP Budget Summary FY71/72

*These are UNICEF funds run through the MOHP budget.
Flow of Funding for the MSNP line Item - Example 2071/72

MOFALD # 365847 (MSNP Line Item): 60 million NRs

MOHP # 370804 (IDHP): 13.8 million NRs

NNFSS (receives 9 million NRs)

District Grants (receives 64.8 million NRs)

Other 3 Districts

Achham
Health: 1.5
Education: 1.4
Agriculture: 2.1
Livestock: 1.2
WASH: 1.9
Women & Children: 1.4
Local Government: 1.9

Kapilvastu
Health: 1.4
Education: 1.6
Agriculture: 1.6
Livestock: 1.1
WASH: 1.9
Women & Children: 1.3
Local Government: 1.9

Paras
Health: 1.1
Education: 1.6
Agriculture: 2.1
Livestock: 0.9
WASH: 1.6
Women & Children: 1.3
Local Government: 1.1

In Millions NRs
Flow of Funding for the MSNP line Item - Example 2071/72

MOFALD # 365847 (MSNP Line Item): 60 million NRs

- District Grants (receives 64.8 million NRs)
  - Achham: 1.4 million NRs
  - Other 5 Districts: 53.4 million NRs

MOHP # 370804 (IDHP): 13.8 million NRs

- NNFSS (receives 9 million NRs)
- 3 million NRs

- MOFALD # 365847 (MSNP Line Item): 60 million NRs
  - District Grants (receives 64.8 million NRs)
    - Achham: 1.4 million NRs
    - Other 5 Districts: 53.4 million NRs

- MOHP # 370804 (IDHP): 13.8 million NRs
  - NNFSS (receives 9 million NRs)
    - 3 million NRs

In Millions NRs:
- Health: 1.5
- Education: 1.4
- Agriculture: 2.1
- Livestock: 1.2
- WASH: 1.9
- Women & Children: 1.4
- Local Government: 1.9
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## Multi-sector Nutrition Plan: Achham Budget Allocation, by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Proposed Budget FY 2071/2072</th>
<th>Proposed Budget FY 2072/2073</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>311,200</td>
<td>1,057,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>1,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Children</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>506,500</td>
<td>1,015,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>425,200</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,707,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,747,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

#1 Take a long view of scale-up when planning follow-up MSNP

#2 Provide budget for transportation and fuel to help district and VDC level stakeholders travel to faraway VDCs

#3 Incentivize staff who work in far-flung VDCs

#4 Ensure more than just information sharing when coordinating activities across government and donor programs to avoid duplication

#5 Emphasize monitoring and evaluation of all programs to reduce misuse of funds and to allow course corrections
#6 Focus on mothers-in-law and husbands to help GTD mothers achieve their goals

#7 Improve bottom-up side of planning to ensure allocated funding is used as directed and meets community needs

#8 External partners should increase efforts to align planned activities and funding to MSNP objectives

#9 Programs should coordinate group formation at the community level so that the same individuals are not called to participate in multiple groups

#10 Improve VDC stakeholders’ understanding, involvement, and ownership of the MSNP
Evidence-based.
Country-led.
Results-driven.
Improving lives through better nutrition.

This presentation was made possible by the American people through the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) under Cooperative Agreement No. AID-OAA-A-11-00031, the Strengthening Partnerships, Results, and Innovations in Nutrition Globally (SPRING) project.1

www.spring-nutrition.org