

# CMAM conference: follow up survey

November 2012

Emily Mates, ENN Researcher



**Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN)**

32, Leopold Street, Oxford, OX4 1TW, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1 865 324996 Fax: +44 (0)1 865 597669

[office@ennonline.net](mailto:office@ennonline.net) [www.ennonline.net](http://www.ennonline.net)

(charity registration no: 1115156)



Canadian International Development Agency Agence canadienne de développement international

# Table of Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	6
Aim and activities	7
Follow up questions	8
Results and Discussion	8
Responses to the follow up questions	9
<i>Question 5</i> – Has there been any progress with the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement in your country?	9
<i>Question 6</i> – Was the conference useful in moving forward the CMAM agenda in your country?	9
<i>Question 7</i> – For the case-study countries – was its development a useful/helpful exercise – if yes, in what ways?	12
<i>Question 8</i> – Was there any dissemination of conference outputs/information in your country?	14
<i>Question 9</i> – What progress has there been with your country-specific action points that were announced at the conference?	15
<i>Question 10</i> – Did the conference generate any additional political commitment for CMAM or nutrition in general. If yes, how?	14
<i>Question 11</i> – Were there any other consequences in your country as a result of the CMAM conference?	16
<i>Question 12</i> – Any questions, comments, other information or points you would like to discuss?	16
ENN actions	17
Conclusion	18
Annexes	
Annex 1: Questions for CMAM follow up telephone conversation	19
Annex 2: Detailed feedback by country	21



# Executive Summary

In November 2011, ENN, in collaboration with the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) hosted a 4-day conference in Addis Ababa at which Government representatives from 22 countries in Africa and Asia, as well as members of international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), United Nations (UN) agencies, the private sector, academic institutions and donor agencies came together to share experiences and to identify lessons for future Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) scale up. The conference aimed to provide a learning forum for Government representatives on CMAM scale-up, to identify enabling factors and processes which allow successful scale up, and to explore the challenges that hinder scale up. Nine countries were supported by the ENN to prepare and present detailed case studies. Specifically, the conference focused on the policy environment, coordination, technical and supply considerations as well as the funding mechanisms that are required to establish, expand and sustain CMAM service provision at national level.

In order to assess what kind of impact the conference might have had in the countries that had sent governmental representatives to Addis Ababa, a follow-up survey was conducted, funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The survey aimed to determine impact of the CMAM Conference by following up with government delegates from each represented country regarding progress with committed actions/next steps, whether the conference (and the development of the case studies) was a useful exercise, and any other consequences of their participation in the Addis conference.

A list of questions was developed to guide the interviews with delegates. Responses were elicited from 17 out of the 22 countries in attendance (77%). Written answers were provided by 4 country delegates (Somalia, Nepal, Bangladesh and Tanzania), while telephone interviews were held with 13 country delegates: 7 from case study countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Pakistan) and 6 from non-case study countries (Zambia, South Sudan, Nigeria, Cambodia, Zimbabwe and Uganda)

Responses indicate that 16 of the 17 countries interviewed stated that the conference was a very useful exercise in moving the CMAM agenda forward in their country. Reasons given include that it helped hearing about and learning from the other countries experience and that the comparisons between the various country experiences enabled useful reflection on their own progress and achievements. Many also said that they appreciated that Government delegates were given the 'space' to discuss the various issues faced when trying to take nutrition interventions to scale. One country (Pakistan) reported that while the conference was useful for information sharing and to highlight the importance of CMAM as a tool to address undernutrition, it was only 'somewhat' useful in advancing the nutrition agenda in Pakistan, due to the process of devolution that the country has been undergoing.

For the development of the case study, delegates from all seven case study countries interviewed said it was very useful. The most common reasons given were: that it provided the stimulus to document (all realised the importance of documentation, but there was never the time to do it and it was helpful having someone to lead on it), it helped pull together lessons so far and summarised and reviewed progress to date, it helped to identify gaps and that it provided the opportunity to tell their "story".

Sixteen of the 17 countries interviewed reported that there had been dissemination of conference outputs/information – mostly through national level coordination or technical meetings. Some countries disseminated only at national level, while others to district level. One country (South Sudan) held informal discussions only with UNICEF and other cluster members, but no formal dissemination occurred.

The range of action points committed to by the various countries varied widely; some countries identifying only one action point, while others identified up to 13. Most countries identified between 1 and 7 action points, with 4 countries identifying 6 action points to follow up on. A total of 96 action points were identified, although they varied considerably in weight, from disseminating conference information, to the endorsement of national nutrition plans. More than half of the action points have been acted upon (54%), a quarter have been 'somewhat' acted upon (23%) and a quarter have not been acted upon (23%); although as the 'weight' of the action points varied considerably, it is not possible to draw firm conclusions from these figures. Most interviewees did report that it was a useful exercise having identified action points, as it provided a focus when returning to their countries following the conference.

Fourteen out of the seventeen country delegates interviewed reported that the conference had generated additional political commitment, largely because of the high level attendees. While most reported that in general political commitment was rising for nutrition due to global efforts, they stated that the high level of participants in Addis Ababa reinforced the idea that nutrition is now an important agenda item which needs increasing amounts of attention, if countries are to reach the Millennium Development Goals on time.

Additional feedback from DFID attributes significant developments in CMAM in India over the past year in part to exposure and knowledge gained for a small group from India who attended the conference. Encouraged by the lessons of both piloting and scaling up CMAM they witnessed at the workshop, senior state government officials hosted consultations on CMAM (within two months) in their states (Madhya Pradesh and Orissa). Bringing together advocates (Right to Food), bureaucrats (Secretaries of Health and Woman and Child Development), technical expertise for the few days of the conference, both formally and informally galvanised a small group to design and push for approvals of pilots in Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. Additionally, meeting colleagues who had been managing CMAM national programmes at the conference enabled the small group to more confidentially discuss and design potential programme issues for India. The scale of the problem in India (over 1 million children with SAM in Madhya Pradesh alone) was also striking when compared to sub Saharan African countries, and only Somalia had a higher prevalence. Now one year after the workshop, with DFID and Supreme Court Commissioners Office support and Valid International technical assistance, State Governments have moved rapidly to get CMAM pilots approved and designed (Madhya Pradesh and Orissa) with plans for local production of RUTF. These significant developments in CMAM in India are an important step towards tackling the country's high levels of acute child malnutrition and moving past policy deadlocks on local production of RUTF.

Feedback from the CIDA representative in Malawi indicated that the conference was useful in building momentum at country level, linking CMAM with the SUN Movement and that political momentum for nutrition was also built within the relevant ministries. Feedback from Irish Aid also indicated that the conference had been especially useful in linking CMAM with SUN and generally through the experience and knowledge gained; both for the government delegates and for themselves while developing their specific country nutrition strategies and when thinking about financing mechanisms, longer-term nutrition programming and exit strategies.

The follow up survey therefore concludes that the conference was an extremely useful tool in advancing the national agenda for CMAM and for nutrition more generally. This was achieved through encouraging high level attendance to galvanise political commitment, highlighting the importance of taking nutrition interventions to scale, and by providing a 'space' for government representatives to share their experiences and work through the various challenges. Active support for documentation of experiences proved a good investment that enabled countries to tell their 'story', and consequently take stock, learn and share vital lessons for future scale up. The government delegates appreciated the resources provided, and the chance to network, both with each other and with global experts, who they now feel able to contact if they require support.

*“The Minister holds himself accountable for nutrition in ways that he didn't before.”*  
South Sudan delegate

# Introduction

In November 2011, ENN, in collaboration with the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) hosted a 4-day conference in Addis Ababa at which Government representatives from 22 countries in Africa and Asia, as well as members of international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), United Nations (UN) agencies, the private sector, academic institutions and donor agencies came together to share experiences and to identify lessons for future CMAM scale up<sup>1</sup>. The conference and the participation of Government representatives were made possible with financial support from Irish Aid (IA), the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

The conference aimed to provide a learning forum for Government representatives on CMAM scale-up, to identify enabling factors and processes which allow successful scale up, and the challenges that hinder scale up. Specifically, the conference focussed on the policy environment, coordination, technical and supply considerations as well as the funding mechanisms that are required to establish, expand and sustain CMAM service provision at national level.

The first three days focused on sharing country experiences with CMAM scale up from nine case study countries that had been through a process of writing their 'story' on scale up prior to the conference, sharing from India as a special case study, as well as unique insights from a further twelve countries attending the conference. The final day provided the opportunity for conference delegates to consider the findings of the CMAM experiences in the context of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement and the implications of the SUN Framework for Action for CMAM scale up.

In order to assess what kind of impact the conference might have had in the countries that had sent governmental representatives to Addis Ababa, a follow-up survey was commissioned. The survey and report was conducted by an ENN consultant, through funding from CIDA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Access meeting report and synthesis of lessons at [www.ennonline.net](http://www.ennonline.net) and view video footage of

# Aim and activities

The aim of the follow up survey was to determine impact of the CMAM Conference held in 2011. This involved follow up with government delegates from each represented country regarding progress with committed actions/next steps and any other consequences of their participation in the Addis conference.

This was achieved through the following activities:

- Review of committed actions by delegate/country recorded at the conference
- Development of a list of questions to guide interviews with delegates
- Follow-up interviews (phone/skype) with country representatives, both from case study and non-case study countries
- Summarise findings in a report

Feedback from DFID, Irish Aid and CIDA is also included in this report.

A number of limitations of the follow-up survey are noted:

The telephone/skype interviews were conducted by the same person who was part of the conference organisation team. While this ensured that there was a good understanding of the country contexts (particularly for reviewing the usefulness of the case study development and follow up of action points), it is acknowledged that the interviewees potentially responded in a more positive manner than they might have, if a previously unknown person had been asking the questions.

Due to the generally poor connections for the skype/telephone interviews, despite all efforts to clearly understand the responses, it is possible that some of the answers, or the context in which the responses were given, might have been misheard by the interviewer.

# Follow up questions

A set of questions were asked to one country delegate from the countries in attendance (both case study and non-case study), in order to identify:

- Whether there has been any progress with the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement in their country
- Whether the conference was a useful exercise for the country delegates in advancing the CMAM/nutrition agenda in their country
- (for the case study countries only) whether development of the case study had been a useful/helpful exercise, and if so, in what ways
- Whether there was any dissemination of conference outputs/information
- What (if any) progress there had been with action points that were announced at the conference
- Whether the conference generated any additional political commitment for CMAM or nutrition in general
- Whether there had been any other consequences as a result of their participation in the CMAM conference
- The status and mechanisms of current financing of CMAM programming in country, to feed into the donor financing mechanisms work that is underway<sup>2</sup>.

For a full list of questions for both case study and non-case study countries, please see Annex 1 (N.B. the first four questions were asked as a 'warm up' and to set the scene during the elapsed time since the conference, not for the purposes of this follow up survey).

## Results and Discussion

Responses were received from a total of 17 out of the 22 countries in attendance (77%). Written answers were provided by 4 country delegates (Somalia, Nepal, Bangladesh and Tanzania), while telephone interviews were held with 13 country delegates: 7 from case study countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Pakistan) and 6 from non-case study countries (Zambia, South Sudan, Nigeria, Cambodia, Zimbabwe and Uganda).

The results of the telephone surveys have been collated, see Annex 2 for the summary table of responses to the follow up questions, by country. More detail on each of the key questions, with additional comments from delegates, are outlined below.

---

<sup>2</sup> Follow up investigation by the ENN in 2012/13 funded by Irish Aid and CIDA.



# Responses to the follow up questions

## Question 5

### Has there been any progress with the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement in your country?

Eleven of the countries interviewed stated that there had been progress with SUN in their country, 3 reported that there had been some progress, with 3 reporting no progress, to date (Somalia, Pakistan, South Sudan). For Somalia, the lack of centralised government means that it is “not the right time” for SUN. For Pakistan, the ongoing process of devolution has led to lack of clarity about where nutrition ‘sits’ at Federal level. For South Sudan, SUN discussions remain at the basic stages, as there is limited understanding of the concept at present. Two countries reported that emails sent to the SUN leadership were unanswered (Pakistan and Uganda).

## Question 6

### Was the conference useful in moving forward the CMAM agenda in your country?

Responses indicate that 16 of the 17 countries interviewed state that the conference was a very useful exercise in moving the agenda forward. Reasons given include that it helped hearing about and learning from the other countries experience and that the comparisons between the various country experiences enabled useful reflection on their own progress and achievements. Many also said that they appreciated that Government delegates were given the ‘space’ to discuss the various issues faced when trying to take nutrition interventions to scale. While the Somalia delegate (representative from UNICEF) did state that the conference was useful, it was further qualified by the reminder that Somalia is a difficult country to work through government structures, as little are in existence at present.

One country (Pakistan) reported that while the conference was useful for information sharing and to highlight the importance of CMAM as a tool to address undernutrition, it was only ‘somewhat’ useful in advancing the nutrition agenda in Pakistan. This was due to the process of devolution that the country has been undergoing, whereby power and responsibility for health has been devolved from National to Provincial level. At the time of the interview, overall housing and responsibility for nutrition issues remains somewhat unclear, with the Director for Nutrition currently based in the Ministry for Climate Change.

More detailed responses to this question are outlined below, by country.

## Case study countries:

### Ethiopia

It was very useful. Especially for what needs to change to move forward, e.g. moving from emergency to development, logistics, funding. The conference provided a focus for these issues, it;

*“provided initiative, ideas and potential to move forward on these issues”*

The same team have since submitted a paper to the UN SCN African Nutrition Congress to be held in South Africa<sup>3</sup>, having got the idea to do this from developing the case study. They realised how important documentation is for sharing ideas and lessons learned.

Additionally, the conference strengthened the will and commitment to keep moving forward on issues for nutrition – gave ideas for what to do and confirmed what they were already thinking about, such as the need for improved coordination and multi-sectoral involvement.

### Ghana

The most useful part was the importance of CMAM being highlighted in the global nutrition agenda - due to interest at the conference and the high level attendees. For Ghana, this was unique, as CMAM has been implemented in the development context only. The conference stimulated a successful search for more longer-term funding (a 5-year programme funded by UNICEF is now being implemented in several districts).

### Pakistan

The conference was very useful because they learned many things from other countries. The delegates heard about actual scenarios and could listen to how other countries dealt with their various problems – and how the scaling up of CMAM is a vital part of the development needs of populations with massive undernutrition problems, such as Pakistan.

### Malawi

Learned a lot from what others were doing. Stated that it was a real “eye opener” for Malawi participants – realised that there were many similar problems that others were facing, but also some important differences. They were very impressed to see how far ahead Malawi was regarding integration of CMAM in many ways.

---

<sup>3</sup> Nutrition Congress Africa 2012. Transforming the Nutrition Landscape in Africa. 30 Sept – 4 Oct, 2012. Bloemfontein, South Africa.

## Mozambique

The conference was very useful for the nutrition programme as a whole. High level attendance (Director of Public Health for Mozambique) meant that nutrition got more attention following the conference. It helped also to make partnerships with colleagues from other countries – can now email them and ask for advice.

## Non-case study countries:

All interviewees stated the conference was “very useful”, including Zimbabwe, Uganda, Nigeria, Cambodia, Tanzania, Nepal, Bangladesh.

Specific comments from some country delegates:

## Zimbabwe

The conference was very useful, especially the updates from other countries. Additionally that it was:

*“very important for government to have ownership of CMAM and other nutrition programming”*

*“by coming back from Addis with clear action points, it gave stimulus to the government to take CMAM more seriously”*

It provided the impetus to write up Zimbabwe’s experiences with Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) experiences in Field Exchange<sup>4</sup>.

## Uganda

The conference was “very, very beneficial”. They took ideas from other countries, put into national development plan, through the committee (the Minister for Health was reportedly impressed). There is now a multi-sectoral coordination focal person placed in the Prime Ministers office and the First Lady has become a champion for nutrition. The conference:

*“gave insight and confidence to develop action plans, to make CMAM and nutrition a national issue, high on the agenda”*

---

<sup>4</sup> See Field Exchange 43, [www.enonline.net](http://www.enonline.net)

Nepal

*“there was extensive sharing among the countries - learning from each other really improved our capacity to expand CMAM in the country”*

Bangladesh

*“our knowledge which was updated in the conference is helping us a lot”*

Tanzania

*“the conference was instrumental in ensuring we prioritize CMAM/IMAM, in particular the need to obtain full understanding of the gaps”*

## Question 7

For the case-study countries – was its development a useful/helpful exercise – if yes, in what ways?

All delegates interviewed said it was very useful, including those from Ethiopia, Somalia, Ghana, Pakistan, Malawi, Kenya, Mozambique and Sierra Leone.

Most common reasons given were:

- provided the stimulus to document (all realised the importance of documentation, but there was never the time to do it and it was helpful having someone to lead on it),
- pulled together lessons so far and summarised and reviewed progress to date,
- helped to identify gaps,
- provided the opportunity to tell their “story”.

## More specific comments by country

Ghana

*“documenting was really useful – will you be able to help us do a follow up in a year or two?”*

Malawi

*“very helpful to be given a chance to tell our ‘story’; in Malawi we were doing a lot for many years, but we were not documenting it.”*

Somalia

*“It helped us pull together some lessons over the years. It was a useful way to take stock of work that has been done in previous years”*

Kenya

The interviewee gave a number of reasons why it had been a useful exercise, including that;

- a) “it ‘forced’ us to document the process we had been through, and on time (always wanted to document, but never had the time to do it)*
- b) Meant we learned many lessons along the way*
- c) Facilitated consultation with partners*
- d) Helped us to identify where our gaps were”*

Mozambique

Stated that it helped them to reflect and evaluate on what they have done, and what still needs to be done. Additionally, it helps with partners who want to support – it is an easy entry point. They give them the case study and it broadens their understanding – because it is a formal document, they can analyse what the problem areas are and what needs more focus

*“We do a lot, but do not ever document it”*



## Question 8 Was there any dissemination of conference outputs/information in your country?

Sixteen of the 17 countries interviewed reported that there had been dissemination of conference outputs/information – mostly through national level coordination or technical meetings. Some countries gave a presentation to the meeting, others wrote a report for sharing information. Some countries disseminated at only national level, while others to district level. Ghana reported that the conference was followed on the website by the technical group in-country due to their interest in proceedings. One country (South Sudan) held informal discussions only with UNICEF and other cluster members, but no formal dissemination occurred.

## Question 9 What progress has there been with your country-specific action points that were announced at the conference?

The range of action points committed to by the various countries varied widely; some countries identifying only one action point, while others identified up to 13. Most countries identified between 1 and 7 action points, with 4 countries identifying 6 action points to follow up on. See table 1 below.

	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	12	13	TOTAL
Number of action points identified	1	3	4	5	6	7	8	12	13	96
Number of countries	2	2	3	1	4	2	1	1	1	17

A total of 96 action points were identified, although they varied considerably in weight, from disseminating conference information, to the endorsement of national nutrition plans. Many action points have been followed up, some are in progress, while others have not yet been acted upon, see Table 2 below.

	Yes	Somewhat	No	TOTAL
Action points achieved?	52	22	22	<b>96</b>
Percentage	54	2	3	<b>17</b>

A total of 96 action points were identified, although they varied considerably in weight, from disseminating conference information, to the endorsement of national nutrition plans. Many action points have been followed up, some are in progress, while others have not yet been acted upon, see Table 2 below.

## Question 10

Did the conference generate any additional political commitment for CMAM or nutrition in general. If yes, how?

Fourteen country delegates reported that the conference had generated additional political commitment, largely because of the high level attendees. While most reported that in general political commitment was rising for nutrition due to global efforts, they stated that the high level of participants in Addis Ababa reinforced the idea that nutrition is now an important agenda item which needs increasing amounts of attention, if countries are to reach the Millennium Development Goals on time. In Uganda, the First Lady has become a champion of nutrition, recently launching the national guidelines, while in Cambodia;

*“there is now more attention from high levels. The Prime Minister is more interested as he understands that nutrition is linked to poverty reduction – the conference came at a good time for Cambodia”*

One country delegate reported that there is somewhat more political commitment (Tanzania), while two countries stated that no increase in political commitment was evident - Somalia, due to the lack of centralised government and Pakistan due to the issues surrounding the recent devolution of the health system.

## Question 11

### Were there any other consequences in your country as a result of the CMAM conference?

Four countries reported some unexpected consequences: Malawi (good to meet global experts), Ethiopia (surprise that CMAM is not delivered at primary health care level in most countries), Uganda (surprised at quite how useful conference proved to be) and South Sudan (impressed at how useful high level attendance proved to be)- explaining that in South Sudan,

*“The Minister holds himself accountable for nutrition in ways that he didn’t before”*

## Question 12

### Any questions, comments, other information or points you would like to discuss?

Ten country representatives made some additional comments as follows:

- 2 wanted to know whether it would be possible to assist with documentation in the future as it had proved to be such a useful exercise
- 1 wanted to know when the next conference would be as it was so useful for them
- 1 wants more information from other countries
- 1 wants the UN to provide information as to whether they have followed up on the action points that they stated at the conference
- 1 wants more information about the ENN
- 1 thinks that a CMAM field visit would have been useful during the conference
- 1 wants to know if more partners will support CMAM and whether they will link more with preventative strategies
- 1 thinks that future conferences should link country representatives with potential donors

## ENN actions

A review of donor and government financing arrangements for CMAM was initiated by the ENN in March 2012, co-funded by CIDA and Irish Aid, to investigate a key challenge facing governments that was highlighted at the conference. As part of this work, a series of financing questions (see Annex 1) were asked for each case study country and for one non-case study country (Cambodia). The full report will be available from the ENN in March 2013.

In December 2011, the ENN formally introduced Dr Mary Robinson (President of the Mary Robinson Foundation-Climate Justice), who video-addressed the conference on Day 2, to Dr David Nabarro (Coordinator, SUN movement, and Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Food Security and Nutrition), who led Day 4 which focused on SUN. In April 2012, Dr Mary Robinson was appointed to the lead group of the SUN movement.

## Donor feedback

Feedback was also sourced from DFID, CIDA and Irish Aid (see Annex 1 for questions) and is shared below.

### DFID in India

DFID facilitated the attendance of a small but significant group of policy makers from India at the CMAM Conference. Encouraged by the lessons and presentations they witnessed at the workshop, senior state government officials hosted consultations on CMAM in their states in December 2011 and January 2012, and started to develop proposals to tackle acute malnutrition. Governments of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa moved forward with the significant steps of design and high level approvals (Chief Ministers) for piloting CMAM in their states. By November 2012, one year after the workshop, with DFID support and Valid International technical assistance, there are now CMAM pilots with local production of RUTF in three Indian states (including Madhya Pradesh and Odisha). DFID feels that the ability to learn from colleagues with long standing experience of running CMAM programmes and for a small group of senior officials, the Right to Food Advisor for the Supreme Court Commissioners, technical experts and DFID as a donor to come together out of India was useful. It gave time to discuss and helped build trust and relationships for the work of consistent advocacy over the following year. Valid International were contracted by DFID within two months of the conference ending to support, advise and ensure momentum. Meeting Valid International staff at the conference was a catalyst for this.

## CIDA in Malawi

Feedback from the CIDA representative in Malawi indicated that the conference was useful in building momentum at country level, linking CMAM with the SUN Movement and that political momentum for nutrition was also built within the relevant ministries.

## Irish Aid in Zambia and HQ

Feedback from Irish Aid also indicated that the conference had been especially useful in linking CMAM with SUN and generally through the experience and knowledge gained; both for the government delegates and for themselves while developing their specific country nutrition strategy and when thinking about financing mechanisms, longer-term nutrition programming and exit strategies.

# Conclusion

It is clear from the responses above that the conference was an extremely useful tool in advancing the national agenda for CMAM and indeed for nutrition more generally. This was achieved through encouraging high level attendance to galvanise political commitment, highlighting the importance of taking nutrition interventions to scale, and by providing a 'space' for government representatives to share their experiences and work through the various challenges. The government delegates appreciated the resources provided, and the chance to network, both with each other and with global experts, who they now feel able to contact if they require support.

All seven case study countries contacted felt that development of the case study was a very useful exercise. By providing the support for documentation, they were enabled to tell their 'story', take stock, and learn vital lessons for future scale up. On return to their countries, the majority of representatives had disseminated the information they received from the conference to their colleagues. The majority also felt that the conference had assisted with increasing political commitment for nutrition, with the one day discussion of the SUN Movement providing a useful motivator for advancing discussion and action.

DFID consider the recent significant developments in CMAM in India an important step towards tackling the country's high levels of acute child malnutrition.



# Annex 1

## Questions for CMAM follow-up telephone conversation

1. What is the current status of CMAM in-country – same as in November 2011?  
Expanded further? More focus on new areas (e.g. MAM)? Improved linkages? Other?
2. Any estimates or measurements of coverage?
3. How is the community mobilisation element going – any developments or progress?
4. Any further developments with local production of RUTF?
5. Current SUN status in-country? Do you see progress due to SUN in your country – if yes, in what way?
6. Overall, was the conference useful for moving forward the agenda in your particular country – if yes, how? If not – any reasons?
7. For the case study countries – was development of the case studies a useful exercise – if yes, how? If no – any reasons?
8. Was there any dissemination of conference information/outputs/actions in your country – if yes, how did this happen? If no – any reasons?
9. Action points stated at conference.....(focus on particular action points of each country)
  - a. Any been acted upon?
  - b. If yes – in what way? And how did conference facilitate this?
  - c. If no – any reasons why not?
10. Did the conference generate any additional political commitment for CMAM or nutrition in general? If yes, how?
11. Was there any other or unexpected results emanating from the conference – if yes, what, and how did they materialise?
12. Any questions, comments, other information or points you would like to discuss?

Question for twelve non-case study countries

13. Current financing status –
  - a. emergency/development funds? Sufficient?
  - b. What do you see as the main funding challenges for scaling up CMAM? (if no information, get name of person in finance or other ministry that we can follow up with)

## Additional finance questions for case-study countries to feed into Donor Financing Mechanisms work

1. How has CMAM scale up been funded;
  - external official development assistance e.g humanitarian mechanisms, transition or development financing
  - government own funding
  - or a mixture of these
2. Briefly describe the funding mechanism/s i.e. do funds go directly to government, to partner/implementing agencies, how long does the funding last before additional funding needs to be sought
3. Are some components of CMAM funded more easily than others through these mechanisms e.g. RUTF rather than community mobilisation and which component/s is/are more difficult to get funded
4. Have the type of funding that you received created any difficulties for scale-up, if so, can you give any examples of this (e.g. short term nature of funding constrained planning, areas of programming that were difficult to fund, etc)
5. Do you consider the funding that you have had so far for CMAM scale up to be sustainable? If not, what form would sustainable funding take? Or how would you ideally like to see funding arrangements modified in the futures
6. On the basis of your experience to date, has the government developed an explicit funding strategy/plan for CMAM scale up (or for nutrition in general)?

## Questions for CMAM follow-up – Donors

1. Overall, was the conference useful for moving forward the CMAM or nutrition agenda in your country of work? If yes, how? If no – any reasons?
2. Did the conference generate any additional political commitment for CMAM or nutrition in general? If yes, how?
3. Do you think that government officials in your country of work benefited from attendance at the conference – did anything change or move forward as a result of their attendance?
4. Was there any other or unexpected results or impact emanating from the conference – if yes, what, and how did it materialise?

# Annex 2

Summary table of follow up responses										
Country	Sun Status/Progress	Was Conference useful?	Was case study development useful?	Any dissemination of conference outputs/info?	Action points			Increased political commitment?	Any Unexpected results?	Other info?
					Number	Acted upon?	Any reasons why not?			
<b>Malawi</b>	YES – Seen progress as first early riser country	YES – learned from others realised are very far ahead networking opportunity	YES – very helpful telling their 'story' limited previous documentation shared other case studies	YES – shared in quarterly CMAM learning forum and with OPC colleagues	13	YES –9 SOMEWHAT –1 NO –3	2 – MAM related 1 is community level training which has been delayed	YES – reinforcement of SUN principles and high level interest	YES – good to meet global experts and can now contact them	Wants more information from other countries
<b>Somalia</b>	NO – not right time for Somalia	YES – but is a difficult country due to lack of centralised government	YES – pulling together lessons learned taking stock	YES – through nutrition coordination groups	6	YES –2 SOMEWHAT –2 NO -2	2 points higher level which need govt action – still no govt in Somalia	NOT REALLY – limited formal political system	NO	NO
<b>Ethiopia</b>	YES – but still worried about excess reporting requirements	YES – especially for identifying what needs to change to move forward	YES – v helpful summarising progress have since submitted another paper as realised importance of regular documentation	not relevant as conference held in Ethiopia so was already wide dissemination	4	YES –3 NO –1	development of an advocacy plan for nutrition – very difficult to achieve	YES – especially for provision of ideas of what to do next, high level attendees	YES – surprised so many countries still at low level for CMAM implementation e.g. not delivering services at PHC level	NO
<b>Kenya</b>	YES – July launch, trying to get high level buy-in	YES – facilitated many things, e.g. logistics, coverage stimulated wider buy-in form the NTF	YES – v helpful 'forced' documentation learning lessons, identifying gaps facilitated consultation	YES – through NTF and heads of national provinces. The resources provided at the conference were very useful	8	YES –7 SOMEWHAT –1		YES – provided tools to help showed need for scale-up, high level attendees	NO	NO
<b>Mozambique</b>	SOME – No official launch yet, but SUN-type coordination mechanisms are helping	YES – networking opportunity high level attendees was useful when back to Moz strengthened in-country partnerships	YES – v useful opportunity to document opportunity to reflect and evaluate useful to have a formal document	YES – through nutrition coordination mechanisms and Vice Minister's office	6	YES –0 SOMEWHAT –4 NO –2	All are major action points, one leads onto the other – on the way to achieving, but not there yet. Staff loss (Director) has been difficult	YES – through having high level person in attendance	NO	NO
<b>Pakistan</b>	NO – emails sent to SUN leadership but no answer	SOMEWHAT – health policy context very difficult at present due to devolution processes. But was very useful for information sharing and to see CMAM as an important tool for undernutrition	YES – realised the fragmented approach to date very good to document	YES – at federal level, not so much at provincial level though	6	NO –6	all relate to the national PC1 project - delayed due to the devolution process. Aim to have started this by mid 2012	NOT REALLY – devolution problem	NO	Wants UN to answer questions regarding whether their action points (stated at the conference) have been followed up on

Case study countries

# Annex 2

Summary table of follow up responses (continued)										
Country	Sun Status/Progress	Was Conference useful?	Was case study development useful?	Any dissemination of conference outputs/info?	Action points			Increased political commitment?	Any Unexpected results?	Other info?
					Number	Acted upon?	Any reasons why not?			
Ghana	YES – Launch done in December 2008. Scale up strategy document being developed – costing plan alongside it.	YES – very. Due to the publicity for the conference (emails before about the website and podcasts, etc) the technical committee members were watching and monitoring the events during the conference period.	YES – very. Importance of documentation (hadn't been doing enough) and advocacy through Monitoring challenges and constraints	YES – presentation given to the technical committee about the key points raised at the conference. Members realised the importance of CMAM in the global nutrition agenda – due to high level attendees	YES – 3 SOMEWHAT – 2 NO – 2	delays to regional and district level SUN launch	YES – along with SUN. Nutrition coordination activities are now managed by the national development planning commission = more visibility for nutrition issues and more access to decision makers	NO	documenting was so useful – could you help us in a year or two to do a follow up?	
	YES – joined in Feb 2012. trying now to coordinate with multisectoral partners. Wanting to launch, will select focal person also	YES – learning from other countries helped provide direction for country simulated more scale-up	YES – extremely useful chance to review programme provided detailed perspective of what happening on ground good for team building	YES – presented to the wider nutrition group – helped with motivation as all doing lots for integration of CMAM in-country	YES – 1 SOMEWHAT – 3 NO – 1	most are ongoing. Takes longer than hoped as always other competing priorities	YES – conference came at a good time as nutrition agenda is moving forward. Conference gave nutrition more visibility, esp for policy makers, high level attendees	NO	what is next? Developing paper was so useful as doing so much but not documenting. Would like assistance to document further in future	
Zimbabwe	SOMEWHAT – needs more assistance from the SUN group. Have the policy in place, now need a strategy	YES – very updates from other countries encouraging govt ownership realised importance of CMAM		YES – to MoH, nutrition cluster and at national meetings	YES – 7 SOMEWHAT – 4 NO – 1	need to finalise policy first – identified ambitious action points	YES – govt taking malnutrition more seriously – provided stimulus for action, high level attendees	NO	NO	
Uganda	YES – incorporated into national development plan but SUN leadership did not reply to emails	YES – very, very useful. Minister for Health impressed and First Lady has since become a nutrition champion		YES – widely disseminated through national and local meetings and coordination structures	YES – 5 SOMEWHAT – 1	not quite completed, but is underway	YES – First Lady launched the nutrition guidelines. Is now mandatory screening for malnutrition in IMCI, high level attendees	Just surprised at HOW useful conference was	when is the next conference?	
Nigeria	SOMEWHAT – needs updating of policy and strategy	YES – part of the catalyst for nutrition moving forward		YES – to nutrition partners meeting	YES – 2 NO – 1	not sure	YES – from conference, but also from other sources/things	NO	wants more information about ENN	
Case study countries										
Non-case study countries										

# Annex 2

Summary table of follow up responses (continued)										
Country	Sun Status/Progress	Was Conference useful?	Was case study development useful?	Any dissemination of conference outputs/info?	Action points			Increased political commitment?	Any Unexpected results?	Other info?
					Number	Acted upon?	Any reasons why not?			
Case study countries	<b>Cambodia</b>	YES – interest stimulated just before conference, so it came 'on time' for Cambodia	YES – learned from other countries what to do with all forms of malnutrition	YES – through nutrition working group	4	YES – 3 SOMEWHAT – 1	NGOs still receive more funding than the govt for implementation	YES – more attention from high levels. Prime Minister more interested as is linked to poverty reduction – conference came at good time for Cambodia	NO	NO
	<b>South Sudan</b>	NOT REALLY – Still remaining a concept that is not understood by most stakeholders in-country. Thinks that most actors haven't heard about it (especially in other sectors of govt) – also not clear at country level, who at the global level is responsible. Needs follow up at high level in country. Still in v basic stage	YES – v useful due to Minister attendance - better understanding at high levels of nutrition issues. Has since made remarks on 2 occasions and mentioned nutrition – this is the first time anyone has ever heard a senior member of the MoH discuss nutrition	SOMEWHAT – informal discussions with cluster and nutrition partners	7	YES – 2 SOMEWHAT – 3 NO – 2	problems with agreements between Sudan and South Sudan have diverted some resources (oil money) and time	YES – through high level attendance with the Minister being present for most of the conference	YES – again through the high level attendance – had a far greater effect than imagined	would have preferred the follow up to have been conducted earlier.
	<b>Zambia</b>	YES – launch of national food security and nutrition strategic plan- hoped at end 2012, start 2013. management of acute malnutrition is major aspect of this plan	YES – Very helpful as highlighted many issues and helped to see what other countries had faced and how they dealt with challenges. Brought us together with new partners e.g IA	YES – Report written and was shared with the Director of nutrition	1	YES – 1	YES – partly from conference, but mostly due to global level interest rising – is filtering down to countries, high level attendees	NO	NO	Wants to know if more partners will support CMAM and also combination programmes including preventative strategies
Non-case study countries	<b>Bangladesh</b>	YES – focal point identified, country plan developed	YES – updated knowledge	YES – at national and regional level forums	1	YES – 1		YES – commitment increased due to participation	NO	Field visit during the conference would have been useful
	<b>Tanzania</b>	YES – 6 directives have been devised and implemented including NNS development, food fortification standards, etc	YES – improved understanding of the gaps	YES – through technical working group and district level meetings	4	YES – 3 NO – 1	not specified	SOMEWHAT – political commitment, but not government commitment	NO	Future conferences should link country representatives with potential donors more
	<b>Nepal</b>	YES – high level committee established SUN focal point identified	YES – extensive sharing amongst countries	YES – during CMAM review meetings	3	YES – 3	YES – CMAM given more priority	YES – CMAM given more priority	NO	NO