



UNAP-SUPA District Level Scaling-Up Discussion Workshop

Kibaale District

July 21, 2015



REACH
ACCELERATING THE SCALE-UP OF FOOD AND NUTRITION ACTIONS

Hosted by the World Food Programme



Foreign Affairs, Trade and
Development Canada

Affaires étrangères, Commerce
et Développement Canada

Aims of the workshop

- 1. To review the Nutrition Stakeholder and Action Mapping results (by district) and understand how they can be used for planning**
- 2. To build the capacity of district level staff to use the stakeholder mapping data to inform district-level nutrition planning.**

Expected Outcomes

- 1. Participants will understand and be able to interpret the UNAP SUPA data for use in the district nutrition planning process.**
- 2. A priority list of nutrition actions to scale-up in the district over the next one year and how they will be scaled up.**

Schedule

Time	Session
8.30-9.00	Arrival and Registration
9.00-9.10	Welcome and Introduction (Schedule and workshop objectives)
9.10-9.20	1. Background and objectives of the UNAP SUPA stakeholder mapping and how links to ANI project
9.20-10.00	2. Presentation on the results of the UNAP SUPA stakeholder mapping
10.00-10.20	Q&A session
10.20-10.40	Break
10.40-11.30	3. Group Work I: Review of the results
11.30-12.30	4. Plenary: Group presentations and discussion
12.30-1.00	5. Using the results for planning – Presentation on potential role of mapping results in planning
1.00-2.00	Lunch
2.00-3.00	6. Group Work II: Review of the district plans to prioritise the nutrition interventions for the district by sector groups.
3.00-4.00	7. Plenary: Group presentation and discussion
4.00-4.20	8. Presentation: Tracking Progress
4.20-4.30	9. Wrap up and Conclusion
4:30	Tea and Departure

Contents

- **Part One:** Introduction to the UNAP SUPA Stakeholder Mapping
- **Part Two:** Key Findings From the UNAP SUPA Pilot in the District
- **Part Three:** Review of the Mapping Results for the District
- **Part Four:** Using the Results for Planning
- **Part Five:** Review of the District Plan
- **Part Six:** Tracking and Evaluating Progress

Part One: Introduction to the UNAP SUPA Stakeholder Mapping

Why UNAP SUPA Stakeholder Mapping in Uganda?

The Uganda Nutrition Action Plan (UNAP) 2011-2016 aims to:

Reduce the magnitude of malnutrition in Uganda and its impact on the individual, household, community and the nation at large by ensuring that the right target groups are being reached with the right nutrition actions (Core Nutrition Actions – CNAs)

To be able to *determine the current situation* and then *plan to scale-up CNAs*, UNAP Decision-makers need to know:

- *Who is currently being reached*
- *by Whom*
- *with What actions*

The UNAP Scale-Up Planning Approach (SUPA) tool – which is based on a REACH tool - can help us to understand about the current scope of CNAs and the potential for scale-up in Uganda

UNAP SUPA Stakeholder Mapping Aims

The Uganda Nutrition Action Plan (UNAP) Scaling Up Planning Approach (SUPA) stakeholder mapping aims to comprehensively review the nutrition landscape in the country to:

- Inform policy-makers and nutrition stakeholders about the make-up of the nutrition landscape
- Establish which CNAs to scale up in order to impact on key nutrition situation indicators as well as to determine:
 - 1.Where** - to scale-up each action
 - 2.Who** - which target groups to focus on
 - 3.How** - which delivery channels to be used
- Monitor CNA scale-up, evaluate coverage, and inform decision-makers, for planning and advocacy purposes

Why UNAP SUPA Stakeholder Mapping in Uganda?



Who does what, where?


How many beneficiaries are reached?

Via which delivery mechanisms?




Overall: Shows the current level of intervention activity and, by showing the gaps, **the potential for scale-up of mapped CNAs, particularly at district level**

What questions can we answer about scaling-up with UNAP SUPA that can inform planning?




What is the current nutrition situation? What indicators should be focused on?

- Status information on nutrition situation




What is being done and what CNAs should be scaled-up? Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?

- Status information on “who is doing what where” including geographic coverage
- Identification of action implementation gaps



What is the coverage of target beneficiaries and the scale-up need?

- Status information on service delivery to beneficiaries
- Identification of scale up need



What is the current utilization and potential of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?


- Status information on utilization of delivery mechanisms
- Estimate of scale-up potential of delivery mechanisms

Discussion of scale-up strategy among relevant stakeholders

- Specify current status/ challenges/bottlenecks of each CNA
- Agree on CNAs to scale-up
- Assess options for scaling-up (responsible actor, delivery mechanism, etc.)
- Overall, this process allows the districts to make informed decisions on the CNAs to scale-up and how

What other information is available to support district planning for scaling up?

It was agreed to pilot UNAP SUPA in the six WHO-ANI project districts as the efforts are complementary:



Combined, results from ANI and UNAP SUPA exercises can be used to inform Nutrition Scale-up Planning Processes in Uganda!

What has happened in Uganda so far and what are the next steps? (1)

1

April – June 2014: REACH assisted Ugandan partners to adapt REACH tool to Uganda, resulting in UNAP Scaling Up Planning Approach (SUPA)

2

MoH/WHO/ANI Project agreed to pilot the UNAP SUPA in 6 districts, along with ANI Baseline Data Collection Exercise

3

June 2014: REACH Facilitators, together with Multi-sectoral stakeholders, identified CNAs for Uganda

4

July 2014: With MoH/WHO and consultants, REACH carried out orientation and training for national- and district-level partners on UNAP-SUPA tool

5

July 2014: REACH populated UNAP SUPA's Excel database with background data, including pop figures and Nutrition Situation Indicators

6

July-Sept 2014: In tandem with MoH/WHO ANI Project baseline data collection, REACH conducted interviews in 6 districts and at national level

What has happened in Uganda so far and what are the next steps? (2)

7

October – November 2014: REACH cleaned and analysed data for 6 districts and related national-level data

8

December 2014: MoH/WHO & REACH disseminated results and conducted training for district- and national-level decision-makers on UNAP SUPA tool

9

June 2015: Hold scaling-up discussions in each district, to determine which CNAs need to be scaled up, and adjust District Nutrition Action Plans

10

June 2015: Identify UNAP SUPA M&E focal persons in each district

11


July 2015: Train M&E focal persons in UNAP SUPA process; organise and conduct round 2 of data collection in six ANI Districts

12

July 2015: Establish UNAP SUPA database at district level

Part Two: Key findings that can be used to inform the planning process

What is the current nutrition situation? What indicators should be focused on?




	Situation Indicators	Status National	Trend	Severity	Target 2016	Status Western	Status Kibaale
Stunting	Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years old	33%	↗	●	32%	44%	39%*
Underweight women	Prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years old (with BMI < 18.5 kg/m2)	12%	↗		8%	8%	
Anaemia women	Prevalence of anaemia among women 15-49 years old	23%	↗	●	30%	17%	
Low birth weight	Percentage of newborns weighing < 2.5 kg at birth	10%	↗		9%	8%	
Underweight under 5 years	Prevalence of underweight among children under 5	14%	↗		10%	16%	16%*
Wasting	Prevalence of wasting among children under 5 years old	5%	↗	●	N/A	3%	5%*
Exclusive Breastfeeding	Percentage of infants exclusively breastfed to age 6 months	63%	↗		75%	???	69%*
Anaemia under 5	Prevalence of anaemia among children under 5 years old	49%	↗	●	50%	39%	69%*
Diarrhoea	Prevalence of diarrhoea among children 6-59 months	23%	↗		N/A	19%	39%*
Food Security	Percentage of households with poor or borderline food consumption	20%	↗		N/A	18%	

What situation indicators are most important to focus on in the district?

Sources: DHS 2011, 2006, CFSVA 2013, 2009 & Baseline Survey of Dietary Intake and *Nutritional Status of Children 0-23 Months in Eastern and Western Districts of Uganda 2014

What is the current nutrition situation? What indicators should be focused on?



Prevalence of anaemia among children under 5 years old

National Target 2016 – 50%; Eastern – 55%


Prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years old (with BMI < 18.5 kg/m²):

National Target 2016 – 8%; Eastern – 20%

Percentage of households with poor or borderline food consumption:

National Target 2016 – 20%; Eastern – 24%

What is being done and what CNAs should be scaled-up?





Country Priority Actions		Target Groups	Hoima	Iganga	Kibaale	Luuka	Masindi	Namutumba	Total districts covered
IYCF	Promote optimal breastfeeding practices (e.g. BFHI, BFCI)	Pregnant & lactating women 15-49 years							6
		Fathers 15-49 years							5
	Promote optimal complementary feeding practices	Grandmothers							4
		Mothers / caregivers 15-49 years							6
Micronutrients	Provide vitamin A supplements	Fathers 15-49 years							5
	Provide iron / folic acid / iron supplements	Grandmothers							3
SAM/MAM	Provide therapeutic feeding for SAM	Children 6-59 months							4
	Provide supplementary feeding for MAM	Pregnant women 15-49 years							2
Disease prevention & management	Provide insecticide treated bed nets	Adolescent girls 10-19 years							1
		Children 0-59 months with SAM							2
	Provide deworming tablets	Children 6-59 months with MAM							3
		Pregnant & lactating women 15-49 years with HIV/AIDS							1
MNCH	Provide diarrhoea treatment with ORS / ORS-zinc	Children 0-59 months							3
		Pregnant & lactating women 15-49 years							3
	Provide PMTCT/EMTCT in line with Option B+ policy (incl. ARV, nutrition counseling)	Households							3
		Children 5-9 years							4
Fam Plan	Provide family planning services	Children 6-59 months							4
		Pregnant women 15-49 years							3
		Children 0-59 months						6	
		Children 5-9 years						1	
		Men 15-49 years						3	
		Women of reproductive age 15-49 years						5	
		Adolescents 10-19 years						3	


Note: Three CNAs at national level not represented:

1. Produce fortified wheat flour
2. Produce fortified maize flour
3. Produce fortified vegetable oil

Key:

-  CNA implemented in district
-  CNA not implemented in district


What is being done and what CNAs should be scaled-up?



Country Priority Actions		Target Groups	Hoima	Iganga	Kibaale	Luuka	Masindi	Namutumba	Total districts covered
Food & Agriculture	Provide materials for small-scale horticulture / crop diversification with a nutrition objective	Smallholder farmer households							6
	Provide livestock, poultry or fish for small-scale animal husbandry or aquaculture with a nutrition objective	Smallholder farmer households							6
	Provide materials / infrastructure for food processing, preservation and storage with a nutrition objective	Smallholder farmer households							5
WASH	Facilitate construction of improved sanitation facilities	Primary schools							6
		Households	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	Secondary schools	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	
	Provide materials for improved household water	Households							3
	Facilitate construction of handwashing facilities	Primary schools	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
		Secondary schools	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Social Protection	Households	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	Carry out / support Public Works Projects	N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Provide conditional food/cash transfers with a nutrition objective	Households with an income lower than Pregnant & lactating women 15-49 years							3 1
Total number of actions per district			12	13	18	17	12	14	


Are the right CNAs being focused on to impact on chosen indicators?

What is being done and what CNAs should be scaled-up?



What does the data tell us:

- Out of 20 CNAs, 18 are being implemented in the district. This is the highest number across the 6 districts.
- Two CNAs are not being implemented at all in the district
- A further 7 CNAs are not reaching all target groups




Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?

Focus: which organisations are supporting what CNAs in the district. This is crucial information when thinking about scaling-up so the following can be considered:

1. What organisations are implementing each CNA (**field implementers**)? Can they do more? What organisations could also potentially implement?
2. Which organisations support each CNA (**catalysts**) – can they give more technical support or leverage more support from other organisations?
3. Who is funding the CNAs (**donors**) – can a case be made for them to contribute further funds (advocacy)? Who are other potential donors?

Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?


A Summary



	Country Priority Actions	FI	Cat	Donor
IYCF	Promote optimal breastfeeding practices (e.g. BFHI, BFCI)	7	5	7
	Promote optimal complementary feeding practices	8	8	12
Micronutrients	Provide vitamin A supplements	4	2	7
	Provide iron/folic acid / iron supplements	1	0	3
SAM/ MAM	Provide therapeutic feeding for SAM	0	0	0
	Provide supplementary feeding for MAM	3	2	6
Disease prevention & management	Provide insecticide treated bed nets	3	2	6
	Provide deworming tablets	5	2	9
	Provide diarrhoea treatment with ORS / ORS-zinc	2	1	5
	Provide PMTCT/EMTCT in line with Option B+ policy (incl. ARV, nutrition counseling)	2	0	3
MN CH	Carry out growth monitoring	2	2	5
Fam Plan	Provide family planning services	3	2	7

Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?

A Summary




	Country Priority Actions	FI	Cat	Donor
Food & Agriculture	Provide materials for small-scale horticulture / crop diversification with a nutrition objective	6	4	9
	Provide livestock, poultry or fish for small-scale animal husbandry or aquaculture with a nutrition objective	5	2	6
	Provide materials / infrastructure for food processing, preservation and storage with a nutrition objective	3	1	3
WASH	Facilitate construction of improved sanitation facilities	3	1	7
	Provide materials for improved household water treatment	1	1	3
	Facilitate construction of handwashing facilities	3	1	8
Social Protection	Carry out / support Public Works Projects	0	0	0
	Provide conditional food/cash transfers with a nutrition objective	1	0	1
Total Number of Organisations Supporting		17	15	24

Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?

 Lowest to highest number of organisations involved

Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs? (organisations implementing / supporting / funding CNAs in the district)



What does the data tell us:

Field Implementers:

- There are 17 field implementers in the district with NGOs dominant along with some local government involvement.
- A large number of field implementers are involved in implementing agriculture and IYCF related actions.


Catalysts:

- There are 15 catalysts, comprised mainly of NGOs with some UN agencies and other bilaterals/multilaterals
- The number of catalysts working in each sector follows a similar pattern to field implementers

Donors:

- There are 24 donors, including NGOs, private organisations, the UN, other multilaterals/bilaterals and also the Government itself. Many of them are funding activities in IYCF, Health, Agriculture and WASH sectors.

What is the coverage of target beneficiaries and the scale-up need?



Results for coverage of target beneficiaries for each CNA by the identified situation indicators:

- Underweight women
- Anaemia women

Women of reproductive age

- Low birth weight
- Underweight children under 5
- Wasting children under 5
- Exclusive breastfeeding
- Anaemia children under 5
- Diarrhoea children 6-59 months

Infants & children under 5 years old

- Food security

All population groups with focus on above groups


Prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years old (with BMI less than 18.5 kg/m²)




Indicator Status: 8% Indicator Trend:

Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage

0 actions
1 action
2 actions
3 actions
4+ actions
● Number of actions in district



Indicator Status: 20% Indicator Trend:




Findings:

- Kibaale is implementing all 5 of the 5 CNAs for addressing underweight
- Two of the CNAs have => 30 % coverage.

Actions	Target Groups	Districts					
		Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1 Supplementary feeding MAM	PLW 15-49 years with MAM	-	12%	-	-	-	-
2 Horticulture/crop diversification	Smallholder farmer households	40%	86%	4%	33%	3%	120%
3 Animal husbandry / aquaculture	Smallholder farmer households	11%	34%	1%	3%	7%	32%
4 Food processing / preservation	Smallholder farmer households	13%	3%	0%	4%	-	3%
5 Conditional food/cash transfers	HH income lower than \$1.25/day	13%	20%	-	-	-	5%
	PLW 15-49 years	-	-	-	-	-	48%

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%


Prevalence of anaemia among women 15-49 years old




Indicator Status: 17% Indicator Trend:

Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage

0 actions
1 action
2 actions
3 actions
4+ actions
● Number of actions in district



Indicator Status: 28% Indicator Trend:




Findings:

- Kibaale is implementing 4 out of 5 possible CNAs with 3 of them having => 30% coverage.
- There was no data available on deworming activities in the district.

Actions		Target Groups	Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1	IFA	Pregnant women 15-49 years	-	16%	-	2%	-	-
		Adolescent girls 10-19 years	-	-	-	0%	-	-
2	ITBN	PLW 15-49 years	-	31%	-	-	11%	70%
		Households	-	-	0%	8%	-	115%
3	Deworming	Pregnant women 15-49 years	-	-	1%	3%	1%	-
4	Horticulture/crop diversification	Smallholder farmer households	40%	86%	4%	33%	3%	120%
5	Animal husbandry/aquaculture	Smallholder farmer households	11%	34%	1%	3%	7%	32%

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%


Percentage of newborns weighing < 2.5 kg at birth




Indicator Status: 8% Indicator Trend:

Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage

0 actions
1 action
2 actions
3 actions
4+ actions
● Number of actions in district



Indicator Status: 7% Indicator Trend:





Findings:

- Five out of a possible 6 CNAs are being implemented in Kibaale.
- However, target beneficiary coverage is relatively low for all of them.



Actions	Target Groups	Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1 IFA	Pregnant women 15-49 years	-	16%	-	2%	-	-
2 Supplementary feeding MAM	PLW 15-49 years with MAM	-	12%	-	-	-	-
3 Deworming	Pregnant women 15-49 years	-	-	1%	3%	1%	-
4 Provide PMTCT/EMTCT	PLW 15-49 years with HIV/AIDS	11%	27%	-	8%	1%	135%
5 Family planning services	Men 15-49 years	62%	0%	63%	-	-	-
	Women 15-49 years	57%	4%	60%	0%	-	36%
	Adolescents 10-19 years	3%	-	-	0%	-	30%
6 Conditional food/cash transfers	HH income < \$1.25/day	13%	20%	-	-	-	5%
	PLW 15-49 years	-	-	-	-	-	48%

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%

Prevalence of underweight among children under 5 years old



Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage




Findings:

- Kibaale is implementing all 8 CNAs and is reaching all potential target groups.
- Five CNAs are reaching => 30% of the target population

Actions		Target Groups	Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1	Breastfeeding practices	PLW 15-49 years	94%	170%	11%	2%	3%	55%
		Fathers 15-49 years	5%	51%	4%	0%	1%	-
		Grandmothers	-	95%	1%	0%	1%	-
2	Complementary feeding practices	Mothers / caregivers 15-49 years	136%	223%	20%	92%	84%	57%
		Fathers 15-49 years	11%	65%	5%	0%	6%	-
		Grandmothers	-	64%	2%	-	0%	-
3	Supplementary feeding MAM	Children 6-59 months with MAM	-	90%	-	0%	2%	-
4	Growth monitoring	Children 0-59 months	36%	6%	-	94%	26%	95%
5	Horticulture/crop diversification	Smallholder farmer households	40%	86%	4%	33%	3%	120%
6	Animal husbandry/aquaculture	Smallholder farmer households	11%	34%	1%	3%	7%	32%
7	Food processing/preservation	Smallholder farmer households	13%	3%	0%	4%	-	3%
8	Conditional food/cash transfers	HH income lower than \$1.25/day	13%	20%	-	-	-	5%

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%


Prevalence of wasting among children under 5 years old




Indicator Status: 3% Indicator Trend:

Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage

0 actions
1 action
2 actions
3 actions
4+ actions
● Number of actions in district



Indicator Status: 5% Indicator Trend:





Findings:

- Only supplementary feeding for MAM is being implemented in Kibaale with a high coverage of eligible children.



Actions	Target Groups	Target Groups					
		Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1 Therapeutic feeding SAM	Children 0-59 months with SAM	-	-	-	20%	3%	-
2 Supplementary feeding MAM	Children 6-59 months with MAM	-	90%	-	0%	2%	-

x%	% of target population covered
0-25%	> 0% and <= 25%
25-50%	> 25% and <= 50%
50-75%	> 50% and <= 75%
75-100%	> 75% and <= 100%
>100%	> 100%

Percentage of infants exclusively breastfed to age 6 months



Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage




Findings:

- All 3 of the target groups for breastfeeding counseling are being reached in Kibaale and coverage being => 30% for all.

Actions	Target Groups	Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
		1 Breastfeeding practices	PLW 15-49 years	94%	170%	11%	2%
	Fathers 15-49 years	5%	51%	4%	0%	1%	-
	Grandmothers	-	95%	1%	0%	1%	-

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%


Prevalence of anaemia among children under 5 years old




Indicator Status: 39% Indicator Trend:

Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage

0 actions
1 action
2 actions
3 actions
4+ actions
● Number of actions in district



Indicator Status: 55% Indicator Trend:




Findings:

- In Kibaale, all 4 CNAs are being implemented and coverage of the target populations is => 30% for 3 of the actions.

Actions	Target Groups	Districts					
		Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1 ITBN	Children 0-59 months	-	9%	-	-	1%	70%
2 Deworming	Children 6-59 months	-	31%	0%	4%	5%	-
3 Horticulture/crop diversification	Smallholder farmer households	40%	86%	4%	33%	3%	120%
4 Animal husbandry/aquaculture	Smallholder farmer households	11%	34%	1%	3%	7%	32%

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%


Prevalence of diarrhoea among children 6-59 months




Findings:

- All 4 CNAs are being implemented in Kibaale but improved sanitation facilities and improved handwashing facilities are not reaching all target groups
- However, for ORS/ORS+zinc, improved household water treatment and handwashing facilities, at least one target group has =>30% coverage


Indicator Status: 19% Indicator Trend:



Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage



Indicator Status: 33% Indicator Trend:




Actions	Target Groups	Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
		1 ORS / ORS-zinc	Children 0-59 months	60%	2%	0%	60%
	Children 5-9 years	-	60%	-	-	-	-
2 sanitation facilities	Primary school students	6%	22%	31%	17%	2%	70%
	Households	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
	Secondary school students	-	13%	-	83%	9%	73%
3 household water treatment	Households	1%	40%	-	-	-	30%
	Primary school students	-	42%	14%	-	-	83%
4 handwashing facilities	Secondary school students	-	26%	-	-	-	73%
	Households	-	-	-	0%	-	-

x%	% of target population covered
Red	> 0% and <= 25%
Orange	> 25% and <= 50%
Yellow	> 50% and <= 75%
Green	> 75% and <= 100%
Black	> 100%


Percentage of households with poor or borderline food consumption



Indicator Status: 18% Indicator Trend: N/A




Key: Number of CNAs =>30% beneficiary coverage



Findings:

- All 4 CNAs are being implemented in Kibaale with 2 of them covering => 30% of the target population
- Food processing / preservation is reaching a very small percentage of the target group.


Indicator Status: 24% Indicator Trend: N/A



Actions	Target Groups	% of target population covered					
		Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1 Horticulture/crop diversification	Smallholder farmer households	40%	86%	4%	33%	3%	120%
2 Animal husbandry/aquaculture	Smallholder farmer households	11%	34%	1%	3%	7%	32%
3 Food processing / preservation	Smallholder farmer households	13%	3%	0%	4%	-	3%
4 Conditional food/cash transfers	HH income < \$1.25/day	13%	20%	-	-	-	5%
	PLW 15-49 years	-	-	-	-	-	48%

x%	% of target population covered
0%	> 0% and <= 25%
25%	> 25% and <= 50%
50%	> 50% and <= 75%
75%	> 75% and <= 100%
100%	> 100%

Review: Are the 20 Core Nutrition Actions addressing stunting in the ANI Project districts in Uganda?



1. Among children 6-59 months old 2. Data on the prevalence of stunting is only available at the regional level. 3. Determined based on country-specific situation

What is the **current utilization** and potential of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?



Districts / Delivery Mechanisms	Hospitals / Clinics	Health centers	Health outreach workers	Agricultural extension workers	Farmer field schools	Agricultural business centers / Farmers cooperatives	Farmer groups / associations	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)	Pre-school facilities	Primary schools	Radio	Breastfeeding Week	Child Health Day	Community-based organizations	Local council (LOC)	Village Health Teams (VHT)	Community meetings / dialogues	Women / Mother groups	Traditional birth attendants	Community leaders	Community development officers	Social service outreach workers	Drug shops	Wholesalers	Private companies	Religious centers	NGOs
Hoima	4	7	4	3	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Iganga	0	8	6	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
Kibaale	5	12	6	3	0	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	8
Luuka	0	11	3	1	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	7
Masindi	0	3	7	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6
Namutumba	5	7	1	2	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	3	5	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	6
Average	2.33	8.00	4.50	2.00	1.83	1.33	2.17	2.17	0.33	0.17	1.00	0.17	0.17	0.50	1.00	3.33	2.17	1.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.33	1.33	2.00	6.67

Most common delivery mechanisms in the district: Health centers, followed by NGOs


Least common used delivery mechanism in the district: Primary schools and Breastfeeding week

Number of delivery mechanisms utilised in the district: 16

Key:

 Lowest to highest number of delivery mechanisms used

What is the **current utilization** and **potential** of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?



Kibaale - Delivery mechanisms

Country Priority Actions / Delivery Mechanisms		Hospitals / Clinics	Health centers	Health outreach workers	Agricultural extension workers	Agricultural business centers / Farmers cooperatives	Farmer groups / associations	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)	Pre-school facilities	Primary schools	Radio	Breastfeeding Week	Village Health Teams (VHT)	Women / Mother groups	Wholesalers	Private companies	NGOs	Total number of delivery mechanisms per action
IYCF	Promote optimal breastfeeding practices (e.g. BFHI, BFCI)		■								■	■	■				■	5
	Promote optimal complementary feeding practices	■	■	■							■			■				5
Micronutrients	Provide vitamin A supplements	■	■	■					■				■					5
	Provide iron/folic acid / iron supplements		■	■														2
SAM/ MAM	Provide therapeutic feeding for SAM																	0
	Provide supplementary feeding for MAM		■	■									■	■				4
Disease prevention & management	Provide insecticide treated bed nets		■										■					2
	Provide deworming tablets	■	■	■					■	■			■					6
	Provide diarrhoea treatment with ORS / ORS-zinc		■										■					2
	Provide PMTCT/EMTCT in line with Option B+ policy (incl. ARV, nutrition counseling)	■	■															2
MN CH	Carry out growth monitoring		■														■	2
Fam Plan	Provide family planning services	■	■	■									■				■	5

Synergies

Scale up

What is the **current utilization** and **potential** of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?



Country Priority Actions / Delivery Mechanisms		Hospitals / Clinics	Health centers	Health outreach workers	Agricultural extension workers	Agricultural business centers / Farmers cooperatives	Farmer groups / associations	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)	Pre-school facilities	Primary schools	Radio	Breastfeeding Week	Village Health Teams (VHT)	Women / Mother groups	Wholesalers	Private companies	NGOs	Total number of delivery mechanisms per action
Food & Agriculture	Provide materials for small-scale horticulture / crop diversification with a nutrition objective				■	■												6
	Provide livestock, poultry or fish for small-scale animal husbandry or aquaculture with a nutrition objective				■	■												6
	Provide materials / infrastructure for food processing, preservation and storage with a nutrition objective				■	■												3
WASH	Facilitate construction of improved sanitation facilities															■	■	2
	Provide materials for improved household water treatment		■															1
	Facilitate construction of handwashing facilities															■	■	2
Social Protection	Carry out / support Public Works Projects																	0
	Provide conditional food/cash transfers with a nutrition objective																■	1
Frequency of each delivery mechanism by action		5	12	6	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	7	2	2	2	8	

For delivery mechanisms that are less commonly used, is there potential to strengthen scale up through these delivery mechanisms?

- Limited use of channel (<25%)
- Substantial use of channel (25-50%)
- Majority use of Channel (>50%)

For the most commonly used delivery mechanisms for each action, how can capacity of commonly used delivery mechanisms be increased to support scale up?

Synergies

Scale up

Which Delivery Mechanisms could potentially be scaled up?

What is the **current utilization** and potential of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?



The number of delivery mechanisms used per CNA varies greatly:

Maximum number of delivery mechanisms used: 6 for:

- Provide deworming tablets
- Provide materials for small-scale horticulture / crop diversification with a nutrition objective
- Provide livestock, poultry or fish for small-scale animal husbandry or aquaculture with a nutrition objective

Minimum number of delivery mechanisms used: 1

- a. Provide materials for improved household water treatment
- b. Provide conditional food/cash transfers with a nutrition objective

The number of CNAs using a particular delivery mechanism also show great variation:

- Health Centers are used in a total of 12 different CNAs across nutrition, health and WASH sectors
- In contrast, agriculture-based delivery mechanisms focus almost exclusively on that sector
- Also, a number of mechanisms are used to only implement one CNA such as: Primary schools and breastfeeding week.

What is the current utilization and **potential** of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?



Number of delivery mechanisms identified but currently not utilized including:

Health system	Midwives
Agriculture	Farmer field schools
Schools	Secondary schools
Media	TV, newspapers, billboards
Mass campaigns	Child Health Days
Community	Community based orgs, local councils, community meetings/ dialogues, traditional birth attendants, community leaders, community development officers, social service outreach workers
Private sector	Shops, pharmacies, drug stores, producers
Religious Institutions	Religious centres

Which could potentially be used to implement one or more CNAs?

What do we now know from UNAP SUPA?

Details on current nutrition situation

- ◆ Status information on nutrition situation & indicators ✓
- ◆ Trends and patterns of CNAs ✓

Identification of key stakeholders and geographical coverage

- ◆ Status information on “who is doing what where” ✓
- ◆ Identification CNA implementation gaps ✓

Coverage of target beneficiaries

- ◆ Status information on service delivery to beneficiaries ✓
- ◆ Identification of scale up need X*

Utilization and potential of delivery mechanisms

- ◆ Status information on utilization of delivery mechanisms ✓
- ◆ Estimate of potential of delivery mechanisms X*

*To be looked at more in the planning sessions

Any questions on the findings
presented?

Part Three: Review of the Mapping Results for the District

Group Work

Task: Please divide into groups and review the results, then report back to everyone.

Group Work Task: Please divide into groups and review the results, then report back to everyone.

Key questions to consider...

1. Are there any actions that are being implemented but there is no information provided?
2. Are there any organisations involved (Field implementers, catalysts, donors) that are not included in the results?
3. In terms of target population coverage – do the figures look about right, too high or too low?
4. Have all the delivery mechanisms being used been captured or not? If not, which have been missed out?

Question: What other information should be taken into account when planning to scale-up nutrition in the district?

What other information is available to use in the district?

IYCF KAP and Food Based Dietary Pattern survey

Key nutrition indicators: current nutrition situation

Used in the nutrition situation dashboard

Which key indicators should be focused on in the district?

Landscape Analysis Country Assessment Tool (District Assessment)

Commitment and capacity to scale-up

Where is capacity available / possible to scale-up?

District budget information

Funding

What funds are available to support scale-up?

Need to take into account the nutrition situation when developing scale-up plans in the district

Used ANI
Project
Surveys

What are the main nutrition problems in the district? Who is most affected?

Chronic malnutrition (stunting)?

Acute malnutrition (wasting)?

Micronutrient deficiencies?
(e.g. Vit. A, iodine, zinc, deficiency, anaemia, other)

Overnutrition (overweight & obesity)?

Use ANI
Project
Surveys

What are the main factors contributing to those nutrition problems in the area?

Food insecurity


Sub-optimal care practices

Limited access to health services & poor health environment


Basic causes
(e.g. gender inequities, education, poverty, other)

Conceptual Framework, Triple A, Lifecycle approach - causality of malnutrition

Conceptual Framework



Triple-A Approach




Lifecycle Approach




Part Four: Using the Results for Planning

Linking district level with national level planning is key to focus efforts.

How does district and national level planning work together in Uganda?
Who owns the district level plan?
Bottom-up or Top-down approach?



Key Persons in the District When Planning to Scale-up Nutrition and key sectors



When talking about scaling up need to take into account the following areas

Key Area:	Key Data / Information:	Source of Information:
Severity of the problem – key indicators	Situation Indicator Table	IYCF KAP and Food Based Dietary Pattern survey Baseline
Country / District priority actions	National & District Plans	UNAP
Roles & responsibilities	Who doing what and where	UNAP SUPA
Target Groups/Coverage (current vs target)	Target Beneficiary Coverage	UNAP SUPA
Capacity to scale-up	HR & delivery mechanism potential	Landscape Analysis (District Assessment) UNAP SUPA
Cost	Budgets	District budget process / performance evaluation
Trends / Impact	Situation Indicator Table UNAP SUPA yearly data	IYCF KAP and Food Based Dietary Pattern survey Endline?

Key: Green = Information available from UNAP SUPA

Recap of the key questions to consider in the context of planning for UNAP SUPA data:

Severity of the problem

- What is the current nutrition situation? What indicators should be focused on?

Roles & responsibilities

- What is being done and what CNAs should be scaled-up?
- Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?

Target Groups/Coverage (current vs target)

- What is the coverage of target beneficiaries and the scale-up need?

Capacity to scale-up

- What is the current utilization and potential of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?

What is the current nutrition situation? What indicators should be focused on?

	Situation Indicators	Status National	Trend	Severity	Target 2016	Status Western	Status Kibaale
Stunting	Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years old	33%	↗	●	32%	44%	39%*
Underweight women	Prevalence of underweight among non-pregnant women 15-49 years old (with BMI < 18.5 kg/m2)	12%	↗		8%	8%	
Anaemia women	Prevalence of anaemia among women 15-49 years old	23%	↗	●	30%	17%	
Low birth weight	Percentage of newborns weighing < 2.5 kg at birth	10%	↗		9%	8%	
Underweight under 5 years	Prevalence of underweight among children under 5	14%	↗		10%	16%	16%*
Wasting	Prevalence of wasting among children under 5 years old	5%	↗	●	N/A	3%	5%*
Exclusive Breastfeeding	Percentage of infants exclusively breastfed to age 6 months	63%	↗		75%	???	69%*
Anaemia under 5	Prevalence of anaemia among children under 5 years old	49%	↗	●	50%	39%	69%*
Diarrhoea	Prevalence of diarrhoea among children 6-59 months	23%	↗		N/A	19%	39%*
Food Security	Percentage of households with poor or borderline food consumption	20%	↗		N/A	18%	

Task 1: Decide what situation indicator(s) to focus on based on the status of each indicator and set priorities at district level

Sources: DHS 2011, 2006, CFSVA 2013, 2009 & Baseline Survey of Dietary Intake and *Nutritional Status of Children 0-23 Months in Eastern and Western Districts of Uganda 2014

What is being done and what CNAs should be scaled-up?

Decisions made on what situation indicators to use determine which CNAs should be focused on.

For example: Anemia in women (Prevalence of anaemia among women 15-49 years old)

Related CNAs:

1. Provide iron folic acid / iron supplements
2. Provide insecticide treated bednets
3. Provide deworming tablets
4. Provide materials for small-scale horticulture / crop diversification with a nutrition objective
5. Provide livestock, poultry or fish for small-scale animal husbandry / aquaculture with a nutrition objective

Key questions:

Which of these CNAs are currently (not) being focused on?

Which ones should be focused on?

Task 2: Look at whether the right CNAs are being focused on in the district

Is stakeholder engagement aligned with CNAs?

	Country Priority Actions	FI	Cat	Donor
IYCF	Promote optimal breastfeeding practices (e.g. BFHI, BFCI)	7	5	7
	Promote optimal complementary feeding practices	8	8	12
Micronutrients	Provide vitamin A supplements	4	2	7
	Provide iron/folic acid / iron supplements	1	0	3
SAM/MAM	Provide therapeutic feeding for SAM	0	0	0
	Provide supplementary feeding for MAM	3	2	6
Disease prevention & management	Provide insecticide treated bed nets	3	2	6
	Provide deworming tablets	5	2	9
	Provide diarrhoea treatment with ORS / ORS-zinc	2	1	5
	Provide PMTCT/EMTCT in line with Option B+ policy (incl. ARV, nutrition counseling)	2	0	3
MN CH	Carry out growth monitoring	2	2	5
Fam Plan	Provide family planning services	3	2	7

Task 3: Look at current stakeholder engagement focus and how it may need to change to match chosen priority CNAs

What is the coverage of target beneficiaries and the scale-up need?

Actions		Target Groups	Hoima	Kibaale	Masindi	Luuka	Iganga	Namutumba
1	IFA	Pregnant women 15-49 years	-	16%	-	2%	-	-
		Adolescent girls 10-19 years	-	-	-	0%	-	-
2	ITBN	PLW 15-49 years	-	31%	-	-	11%	70%
		Households	-	-	0%	8%	-	115%
3	Deworming	Pregnant women 15-49 years	-	-	1%	3%	1%	-
4	Horticulture/crop diversification	Smallholder farmer households	40%	86%	4%	33%	3%	120%
5	Animal husbandry/aquaculture	Smallholder farmer households	11%	34%	1%	3%	7%	32%

Task 4: Look at the current coverage of target beneficiaries and set appropriate targets for next year


What is the current utilization and potential of delivery mechanisms to support scale up?

Kibaale - Delivery mechanisms

Country Priority Actions / Delivery Mechanisms		Hospitals / Clinics	Health centers	Health outreach workers	Agricultural extension workers	Agricultural business centers / Farmers cooperatives	Farmer groups / associations	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)	Pre-school facilities	Primary schools	Radio	Breastfeeding Week	Village Health Teams (VHT)	Women / Mother groups	Wholesalers	Private companies	NGOs	Total number of delivery mechanisms per action
IVCF	Promote optimal breastfeeding practices (e.g. BFHI, BFCI)		■								■							5
	Promote optimal complementary feeding practices		■								■			■				5
Micronutrients	Provide vitamin A supplements	■	■	■				■					■					5
	Provide iron/folic acid / iron supplements		■	■														2
SAM/ MAM	Provide therapeutic feeding for SAM																	0
	Provide supplementary feeding for MAM		■	■									■	■				4
Disease prevention & management	Provide insecticide treated bed nets		■										■					2
	Provide deworming tablets	■	■	■					■	■			■					6
	Provide diarrhoea treatment with ORS / ORS-zinc		■										■					2
	Provide PMTCT/EMTCT in line with Option B+ policy (incl. ARV, nutrition counseling)	■	■															2
MN CH	Carry out growth monitoring		■														■	2
Fam Plan	Provide family planning services	■	■	■									■				■	5


Task 5: look at current utilisation of delivery mechanisms for each relevant CNA for the anemia (women) indicator and discuss which could be utilised more or new mechanisms that could be used

What else should be considered?



Task 6: Look at available human resources available in the district to scale-up the chosen CNAs

What else should be considered?



Task 7: Look at whether there is a budget available for the CNAs that should be implemented and who is providing

Using the results for planning – key points

- Decisions made on what situation indicators to use determine which CNAs should be focused on.
- If CNAs are not focused, it is unlikely that any impact will be made on situation indicators
- Stakeholders need to be aligned with the district planning process / focus
- Set targets for scale-up need to be realistic / achievable
- Delivery mechanisms need to be chosen carefully, taking into account available capacity

Part Five: Review of the District Plans

Group Work

Task: Please divide into groups and review the district plans to prioritise the nutrition interventions for the district, then report back to everyone.

Group Work Task: Please divide into groups and review the district plans to prioritise the nutrition interventions for the district, then report back to everyone.

Task 1: Decide what situation indicator(s) to focus on based on the status of each indicator and set priorities at district level

Task 2: Look at whether the right CNAs are being focused on in the district

Task 3: Look at the focus of current stakeholder engagement and how it may need to change to match chosen priority CNAs

Task 4: Look at the current coverage of target beneficiaries and set appropriate targets for next year

Task 5: Look at current utilisation of delivery mechanisms for each relevant CNA for the chosen situation indicator and discuss which could be utilised more or new mechanisms that could be used

Task 6: Look at available human resources available in the district to scale-up the chosen CNAs

Task 7: Look at whether there is a budget available for the CNAs that should be implemented and who is providing

Setting targets for actions to be included in the plan of the district

Task 1: Prevalence of anaemia among women 15-49 years old in the district: _____

Nutrition-related actions <i>District level (e.g. xx%)</i>				Annual target	Delivery mech	HR	Budget
Core Nutrition Actions	Target groups	Implementing orgs	% Pop. coverage (baseline)	% Pop. coverage (2016)	Which delivery mechanisms to use?	Available?	Source
1 Provide iron-folic acid / iron supplements	Pregnant women 15-49 years		0%	XX%		Yes / No	
2 Provide iron-folic acid / iron supplements	Adolescent girls 10-19 years		0%	XX%		Yes / No	
3 Provide insecticide treated bednets	Pregnant women 15-49 years		0%	XX%		Yes / No	
4 Provide insecticide treated bednets	Households		0%	XX%		Yes / No	
5 Provide deworming tablets	Pregnant women 15-49 years		0%	XX%		Yes / No	
6 Promote small-scale horticulture / crop div	Households		40%	XX%		Yes / No	
7 Promote small-scale animal husbandry	Households		11%	XX%		Yes / No	

Task 2
Task 3
Task 4
Task 5
Task 6
Task 7

Review

How does the exercise you just carried out compare with the earlier plan you put together as part of the ANI Project?

- Chosen Actions?
- Target groups?
- Coverage targets?
- Implementing organisations?
- Implementing method (delivery mechanisms)?
- Budget source?

What would you do differently next time when developing nutrition scale-up plans?

Part Six: Tracking and Evaluating Progress

Reviewing the implementation performance of the district

It is important to review the performance of the district each year before the next planning cycle starts so know what the current status of each action is and can then plan accordingly

When implemented

UNAP SUPA data

Nutrition Action	Timeline				Budget	Expenditure	Implementation status				Coverage Target / actual	Notes (e.g. challenges, lessons learned)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4			Fully	Partially	Ongoing	Not		

Next steps for the UNAP SUPA stakeholder mapping

UNAP SUPA Stakeholder Mapping Round 2.

Projects start/finish and actors change frequently. Therefore it is important to update the available stakeholder information on a regular basis in line with the planning cycle

Timing: July 2015

Who will carry out data collection: District M&E officers / planners / nutrition focal persons with support from REACH Team.

Training: Early July in Kampala

Dates of data collection: Mid – July 2015

Pre-task: Need to verify stakeholders currently working in the district

Collecting data on key situation indicators

Collecting data on key situation indicators is important to be able to measure the impact of the nutrition-related CNAs that are being undertaken:

- ANI Project data gives good baseline information BUT will need a measure of progress over the next few years.
- For example: Endline data from the ANI Project
- If no district level data available, can use DHS “regional” level data – or maybe DHS will go to district level.

Thank You!