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| **InterAtion Member Submissions - UN Decade of Action on Nutrition**  **2016-2025 Work Programme** | |
| **Questions** | **Responses** |
| 1. Does the work programme present a compelling vision for enabling strategic interaction and mutual support across existing initiatives, platforms, forums and programmes, given the stipulation of Res 70/259 that the Decade should be organized with existing institutions and available resources? | 1. It does, a lot of statements are general though and will need to eventually be specified and more detailed for member states to have close to uniform interpretation of the document and its contents. 2. We welcome the emphasis in the workplan on coordinating with and building upon existing institutions and initiatives, rather than further fragmenting global governance and accountability mechanisms. The emphasis is rightly on **supporting the development and implementation of ambitious national nutrition action plans – reiterating the need for country ownership that is fundamental to the work of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement.**   While the work programme stresses the need for action by “multiple actors from all sectors”, and specifically references Every Woman, Every Child (EWEC) as one important existing initiative, **it should make clearer links to existing initiatives and platforms in other nutrition-relevant sectors**. For instance, the work programme could highlight the need to **build upon the early efforts to coordinate between SUN, the Sanitation and Water for All partnership (SWA) and the Global Partnership for Education (GPE)**. The Nutrition Decade should provide additional impetus and convening opportunities to significantly shift global governance in this more coordinated, more harmonised direction which will be fundamental to driving ‘nutrition sensitive’ investment and action. |
| 1. What are your general comments to help strengthen the presented elements of the first draft work programme of the UN Decade of Action on Nutrition? | 1. p20. Include food preservation and not assume that it is implied under processing.   p36, 37. Include media (television, social media, internet etc.), they are the modern day environments through which information is gathered and perspectives of young minds influenced.  p38, 39 These paragraphs mention government planning and monitoring but a lot of execution and funding is also influenced strongly by governance.  p43. The ultimate accountable authority in a multi-stakeholder framework needs to be clearly stated by all member states.  p48-51 Advocacy by other non- state actors is not clearly articulated or it’s not being accommodated here? Does “country” mean everyone in the country?  p58-60 Technical support needs to take advantage of the existing indigenous knowledge systems (foods, how to prepare them, how to eat them, preserve them, multiply them etc.) and deliberately plan to strongly engage communities in coming up with solutions for their nutrition and health related challenges. Peer learning, knowledge exchange should be encouraged amongst communities and individuals. Human and other resources within communities should be more fully utilized. Communities are to be encouraged to take more responsibility for their health and nutrition instead of waiting for government or non-government actors.   1. **‘Aims and Added Value’**   **(para 9)** The stated aims should be strengthened by a greater emphasis on not just “addressing” malnutrition (implying a focus on treatment) but **preventing** it. We propose an additional clear aim to “**Support all countries’ efforts to prevent malnutrition through effective multi-sectoral action to address the underlying determinants**”.  **Action areas**  **(para 18)** The reference to conducting “a full and thorough mapping” of existing initiatives and movements is welcome. We propose that this should explicitly include initiatives **between nutrition-relevant sectors**. For instance, **SUN and the SWA have recently agreed a joint work plan for action** on WASH-Nutrition integration – this may provide a useful model and example of cross-sectoral action at the global governance level.  **Action area 1**  **(para 21) Water availability and water resource management** are critical aspects of sustainable food systems (e.g. for adequate and consistent supplies to crops and livestock as well as people) and should be referenced.  **(para 23)** Improving access to WASH is fundamental to **preventing Anti-Microbial Resistance** (AMR).  **Action area 2**  **(para 25)** Achieving UHC requires that the fundamentals of good quality healthcare are in place. Yet the WHO estimate that **38% of healthcare facilities in low- and middle-income countries lack access to water[[1]](#footnote-1)**. 19% do not have adequate sanitation and 35% do not have soap for handwashing. In Sub-Saharan Africa, 42% of healthcare facilities do not have access to water. Ensuring adequate WASH in healthcare is critical to delivering quality health care, including the treatment of malnutrition. The [**Global Action Plan on WASH in Healthcare Facilities**](http://washinhcf.org) co-led by WHO and UNICEF is therefore a key initiative to highlight and coordinate with that will be fundamental to improving nutrition.  **Action area 5**  **(para 37)** We strongly welcome the inclusion of an area on water, sanitation and hygiene. Poor WASH is linked to nutrition in multiple ways, beyond diarrhoeal disease. **The direct biological pathways through which poor WASH is linked to undernutrition includes diarrhoeal diseases, intestinal worms, and environmental enteric dysfunction**, a sub-clinical condition which affects the structure and function of the small intestine, resulting in the poor absorption of nutrients. The paragraph would be strengthened by including a more thorough overview of the key links between WASH and nutrition, and a greater emphasis on the role of hygiene behaviour change as a critical intervention to break the common routes of faecal-oral transmission.  **Means of Implementation**  **(para 45)** We strongly support the proposal for **“a publicly-accessible repository” of commitments** made by Member States in support of the Nutrition Decade, which will help to drive transparency and accountability. This is particularly crucial for commitments to ‘nutrition sensitive’ action, which are often less easy to track and carry greater risk of ‘double-counting’ of existing commitments in other sectors without sufficient thought and effort to enhance nutrition-sensitivity. |
| 1. Do you feel you can contribute to the success of the Nutrition Decade or align yourself with the proposed range of action areas? | Yes |
| 1. How could this draft work programme be improved to promote collective action to achieve the transformational change called for by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the ICN2 outcomes? What is missing? | 1. The draft work of programme will need to be further expanded for member states and other actors to have specific guidance on what each action area includes in greater detail. 2. The work programme must drive a step-change in multi-sectoral coordination for effective Nutrition-sensitive investments and actions. The Global Nutrition Report in 2016 highlighted that scaling up nutrition-specific interventions to 90% coverage in 34 of the countries with the highest burden of child undernutrition, **will only reduce stunting by 20%**.[[2]](#footnote-2) Therefore effective nutrition-sensitive action will be absolutely vital to meeting the goals of the Nutrition Decade and SDG 2. This should be reflected in the work programme by:  * **(para 13)** Making explicit within the ‘guiding principles’ **the need to ensure ambitious funding for ‘nutrition-sensitive’** as well as ‘nutrition-specific’ action, and the role of the Nutrition Decade in **convening high level stakeholders across nutrition-relevant sectors**. * **(para 49)** Ensuring that ‘Action Networks’ have the active participation of government representatives **from across nutrition-relevant ministries** such as Ministers or senior officials for WASH, Education, Agriculture, Health, Planning and Infrastructure. * **(paras 55, 56)** Emphasising that funding modalities and the mobilisation of new financial resources **must include ambitious commitments to nutrition-sensitive investments**. While the World Bank / R4D estimates of the cost of achieving global nutrition targets is an important benchmark, it should not be treated as definitive. Their conclusion that an annual additional $2.2 billion of financing is required to deliver a ‘priority package’ of interventions clearly states **that this estimate is predicated on the assumption of “ambitious commitments in water and sanitation”[[3]](#footnote-3)**, among other nutrition-relevant sectors. Further urgent work is needed to **improve the costing and tracking of nutrition-sensitive investments** by governments and donors, including improving resource tracking of ODA via OECD DAC measurement. |
| 1. Do you have specific comments on the section on accountability and shared learning? | 1. The National accountability framework will need to be clarified by all member states to avoid confusion during implementation. In a multi-stakeholder approach it should be highlighted perhaps that accountability does not have to always fall under the traditional health or nutrition ministries. Local government for example could be very good at convening stakeholders from different sectors and effectively demanding delivery of actions. 2. We welcome the proposals for transparency and accountability. A focus on **shared learning is particularly critical for integration and effective nutrition-sensitive action,** where the evidence and cost-effectiveness of interventions is still being researched. It is vital that governments and donors do **not** only invest in and report on the more limited set of nutrition-specific interventions – since this will not result in meeting the goal to end malnutrition by 2030. Rather, **the Nutrition Decade must act to galvanise rapid experimentation, evaluation and learning to strengthen the global nutrition community’s understanding of what works in effective multi-sectoral action**. |
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