

Food Systems for Nutrition in the Sahel

A joint DFID and French MOFA Workshop

28-30 January 2019, Dakar, Senegal

Workshop Report

23 April 2019



Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	ii
Abbreviations.....	iii
Introduction	1
Goal and Objectives of the Workshop	2
Target Participants and Speakers.....	2
Methodology.....	2
Workshop Proceedings.....	3
Opening session.....	3
Session 1: Setting the scene.....	3
Session 2: Causal pathways and response analysis	5
Session 3: Lessons learnt and good practices	7
Session 4: Multi-stakeholder cooperation and coordination	9
Session 5: Tracking progress and measuring results.....	12
Session 6: My actions on food systems for nutrition.....	13
Session 7: Concluding remarks	14
MQSUN+ Post-script	14
References	16
Annex 1: Workshop Agenda	17
Annex 2: Actions Recommended for Participants.....	19

Abbreviations

ACF	Action Contre la Faim
AFD	Agence Française de Développement
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CLM	Cellule de Lutte contre la Malnutrition
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	UK Department for International Development
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FENAB	Federation Nationale Pour l'Agriculture Biologique
FNS	Food and Nutrition Security
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GLOPAN	Global Panel for Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition (The Global Panel)
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IRD	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
MQSUN+	Maximising the Quality of Scaling Up Nutrition Plus
MOFA	French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition
UK	United Kingdom
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UN	United Nations
WASH	Water, sanitation and hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme
WHA	World Health Assembly

Introduction

Adequate nutrition is essential for good health and for social and economic development. One in three people is malnourished, i.e. undernutrition, micronutrient deficiency, overweight and/or obesity (IFPRI, 2016). Further, undernutrition is linked to about 45 percent of deaths amongst children under age five (Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group, 2013). Evidence suggests that reducing malnutrition is highly cost-effective in saving lives and can boost per-capita gross domestic product (GDP) by up to 11 percent; not doing so can cost between 2 and 17 percent of GDP of African countries (African Development Bank Group, Big Win Philanthropy, 2018). Further, because of intergenerational cycles, malnutrition can perpetuate poverty. Those who are well-nourished when young perform better in school, earn 20 percent more on the labour market and are 33 percent less likely to be poor as adults (DFID, 2008).

As investing in nutrition is an important path to development, the global community has committed to “end malnutrition in all its forms” (FAO & WHO, 2014) and dedicated Sustainable Development Goal 2 (SDG 2) to “end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture” by 2030 (UN General Assembly, 2015). Donors are positioning nutrition high in their portfolios and looking at mechanisms for achieving these aims. In 2016, France developed a multisector roadmap 2016-2020 to address the nutrition priority set out in France’s strategy for development and international solidarity (Ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Développement International, 2016). Similarly, a United Kingdom (UK) Department for International Development (DFID) position paper sets out how the UK will reach the poorest to improve nutrition for at least 50 million people by 2020 (DFID UK, 2017), including by enhancing the nutrition-sensitivity of its investments in agriculture; water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); social protection; and education.

As a means to provide high-quality diets, agriculture has an important role to play, as diets are one of the two immediate causes of malnutrition. Overweight and obesity and child and maternal undernutrition resulting from poor diets are amongst the leading risk factors for the global burden of disease (GBD 2016 Causes of Death Collaborators, 2017). According to the Global Panel for Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition (Global Panel), the risk that poor diets pose to mortality and morbidity is now greater than the combined risks of unsafe sex, alcohol, drug and tobacco use (Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems For Nutrition, 2016).

Unless foods reach people in a form that is nutritious, affordable and otherwise acceptable, even if global food security is achieved, the problem of poor-quality diets will not be solved. Therefore, we must ensure that the systems of producing, processing, storing, distributing, marketing, preparing and consuming food; the actors and elements involved; and the results of these activities—collectively referred to as “food systems”—deliver healthy diets (High Level Panel of Experts, 2017). To improve nutrition for all, sustainably, we need policy and investment actions to transform food systems and move from feeding to well-nourishing people, by providing high-quality diets for all.

The workshop co-organised by DFID and the French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs (MOFA), with the support of Maximising the Quality of Scaling Up Nutrition Plus (MQSUN+), examined the human and economic costs of Sahel’s nutrition situation and looked at how food systems could help respond. It also discussed the existing research and evidence—and remaining gaps—around nutrition and food systems. The workshop explored existing and upcoming opportunities to enhance food systems’ contribution to nutrition as well as concrete action participants can take to better support the integration of nutrition into their day-to-day work related to agriculture and food systems.

Goal and Objectives of the Workshop

The goal of the workshop was to strengthen the capacity of development and humanitarian advisors from DFID, the French MOFA and French Development Agency (AFD) working in the Sahelⁱ on food systems for improved nutrition. This strengthened capacity can enhance these entities' contributions to the global efforts towards eliminating all forms of malnutrition by 2030 through integrating nutrition into food systems and agriculture programming. The workshop's objectives were to:

- Deepen knowledge of the targeted practitioners regarding nutrition and food systems for nutrition, particularly nutrition situation in the Sahel and related challenges and context-appropriate food systems approaches to addressing these challenges.
- Explore practical approaches to improving nutrition through food systems.
- Promote in-country dialogue and stronger cooperation amongst donors and with different actors, including governments, regarding these approaches.
- Identify concrete actions to strengthen nutrition through food systems programming.
- Feed into ongoing discussions and negotiations on food systems and nutrition.

Target Participants and Speakers

More than 40 participants attended the workshop. Participants were mostly development and humanitarian practitioners from DFID, French MOFA, AFD, the European Union (EU), Canada, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). Experts from the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP), Action Contre la Faim (ACF), the French Institute for Research on Development (IRD), the Global Panel for Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) presented in various sessions. Likewise, representatives from a local civil society organisation, the Senegal Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) civil society platform and the Senegalese Unit to Fight Against Malnutrition (Cellule de Lutte contre la Malnutrition, CLM) also shared their experiences.

Methodology

The workshop combined presentations from experts, experience sharing on ongoing programmes, group work and plenary discussion. The workshop sessions were held in French or English—depending on the speaker—and simultaneous translation was offered.

ⁱ Senegal, The Gambia, Mauritania, Mali, Burkina Faso, Algeria, Niger, Nigeria, Chad, Sudan, Eritrea, Cameroon, South Sudan, Central Africa Republic, Ethiopia

Workshop Proceedings

Opening session

The workshop opening was led by **Dr Jean-Pierre Lamarque**, Global Health Advisor at the France Embassy in Senegal, who welcomed participants and introduced the two high level officials for the opening session. **Mr Luc Briard**, First Counsellor of the Embassy of France in Senegal, commended the UK/France partnership on this initiative and expressed the hope that this bilateral collaboration would bring some responses for common development issues. He reiterated that nutrition is a major development challenge requiring an integrated approach with contributions from various sectors such as agriculture, health, WASH, education, etc. **H.E. George Hodgson**, UK Ambassador to Senegal, also praised the UK/France collaboration, the type of partnership which is essential for addressing these complex issues. He reiterated the UK's renewed commitment to African development, with a focus on the Sahel region. Mr Hodgson stated that the UK is eager to engage in the conversation, learn from those who have experience in the Sahel and share DFID experiences from elsewhere.

Session key messages: Nutrition is a major development challenge and multisectoral partnerships are needed in order to accelerate achievement of the SDGs and regional targets.

Session 1: Setting the scene

This session introduced basic concepts, including the definition and different forms of malnutrition. It also provided an overview of the nutrition situation in the Sahel region and its human and economic costs as well as current funding for nutrition. Participants discussed key challenges for nutrition-sensitive food systems programming.

Dr Yves Martin Prevel, Research Director, French IRD, introduced basic **nutrition concepts** relevant to the workshop objectives. After presenting a generic definition of malnutrition, he discussed how various forms of malnutrition affect different age groups: infants and young children, adolescents, mothers and other adults. Whilst stunting and acute malnutrition have been the focus for nutrition action in development assistance, he called for more attention to micronutrient deficiencies and maternal and adolescent malnutrition, which are drivers of stunting and acute malnutrition.

Dr Noel Marie Zagre, UNICEF Nutrition Advisor for West and Central Africa Region (WCAR), presented the current **prevalence and trends of the various forms of malnutrition in the Sahel region**. Whilst important progress has been made in reducing malnutrition rates, the current prevalence is still too high. If progress continues at this pace, the Sahel region will not meet the World Health Assembly (WHA) and SDG targets for nutrition. Thus, there is a need to accelerate progress using a multi-sectoral approach (e.g. health, food and social protection systems).

Professor Sandy Thomas, Director of the Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition, discussed the health, social and economic consequences of malnutrition and the **cost/benefit of addressing nutrition problems in developing countries**. The enormous cost of malnutrition resulting from premature adult mortality, impaired learning potential, poor school performance, compromised adult labour productivity and increased health costs provide some rationale of why investing in nutrition is important. By investing in averting malnutrition, donors will contribute to better health,

fewer deaths, greater capacity to learn, increased future earnings and greater economic benefits. Nutrition has a USD1:16 return on investment (IFPRI, 2014).

Ms Claire Chastre, MQSUN+ consultant, addressed the issue of **financing nutrition**. The World Bank estimates that current funding is less than USD2 per child, whilst a little over USD10 per child/per year is needed to scale up the complete package of nutrition-specific interventions required to achieve key nutrition targets, e.g. stunting, breastfeeding, anaemia and wasting (Shekar *et al.*, 2017). Further, most of this funding is for emergency and short-term interventions in fragile countries with limited funding for prevention. Alternative funding potential should be considered through domestic funding including partnership with the private sector, taxation on profitable sectors such as mining and telecommunications and resources invested in nutrition-relevant sectors such as social protection and agriculture, including through national agriculture investment plans.

Discussion

The discussions following these presentations were around these key areas:

- ***The rationale of focusing on the link between malnutrition and GDP and whether addressing malnutrition is an economic or human-centred goal:*** GDP is often used as a proxy to estimate the economic impact of malnutrition because this data is often readily available. The issue of malnutrition is both economic (the negative impact on economies and high return in investment) and human (the impediment to human development).
- ***The funding gap to eliminate all forms of malnutrition:*** Tracking nutrition funding is complex as it requires tracking contributions from various sectors. However, since 2014/2015 the SUN movement is reporting on domestic and official development assistance investments in nutrition. The Global Nutrition Report and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) marker are providing key information.
- ***Framing the narrative to convince donors to increase funding for nutrition in existing programmes and projects of the multiple sectors contributing to nutrition:*** In fact, many donors and other actors are already investing in nutrition, though perhaps a better understanding is needed of the complexity of the causes and solutions, e.g. the role that food systems can play. As examples, the EU is investing in multisectoral programmes with an overall, nutrition-focused objective; UNICEF by targeting child survival and development has an important focus on nutrition; and the Action Against Hunger agriculture model includes nutrition as a key dimension.

Following the discussion, participants identified and discussed their perceptions of the key challenges for making food systems work better for nutrition (Box 1). As with the presentations, this list helped set the scene for subsequent discussions.

Box 1. Participants' perceived challenges for food systems for nutrition programming.

- Insufficient political will.
- High cost of interventions.
- Insufficient guidance on how to operationalise nutrition-sensitive food systems.
- Weak alignment of various sectors towards the common goal of improving nutrition.
- Weak multisector coordination.
- Inadequate nutrition mainstreaming in policies, programmes and projects.
- Low consumer demand for healthy food.
- Insufficient private sector engagement.
- Lack of information and knowledge on nutritional value of food.
- Weak nexus between development and humanitarian nutrition programming.
- Lack of harmonisation of development actions.
- Power conflicts
- Conflict of interest.

Session key messages

The Sahel is not on target to achieve global targets for improving nutrition. The cost : benefit of addressing nutrition problems is low and yet financing is not where it should be. Food systems is an emerging approach to help address malnutrition and yet participants were quickly able to identify some challenges to uptake. These included issues of political will and private sector engagement, conflicts of interest and power conflicts, alignment and coordination of actors and actions, costs and demand, information and operationalisation and mainstreaming. Participants can contribute to addressing challenges to improving nutrition, including through food systems, by advocating, contributing within the SUN networks, fostering synergies and other means.

Session 2: Causal pathways and response analysis

This session focused on the drivers of malnutrition, key principles for improving nutrition through food systems as well as possible interventions that can help address them. It also addressed the opportunities for maximising nutritional outcomes within and along the various functions of the food system. This session likely provided fodder for the actions on “improve food systems interventions’ potential to benefit nutrition” and “build the evidence base and strengthen its use in decision-making” agreed to later in the workshop.

By way of introduction, Dr Martin-Prevel presented the concepts related to **food security, food systems and nutrition-sensitive approaches**, including nutrition-sensitive agriculture. There is a need to move away from the two opposing and simplistic views regarding nutrition—i) from an agriculture perspective, malnutrition equals hunger and ii) from a health perspective, malnutrition equals disease—towards an integrated, multisectoral approach. There are key principles of how to make agriculture and food systems more nutrition-sensitive (Box 2) and pathways through which they can improve nutrition, i.e. i) the production pathway—promote the availability of diverse, nutritious foods through nutrient enhancing actions; ii) the income pathway—more income can lead to increased access to healthier foods and health services—when combined with nutrition education and behaviour change; and iii) the women’s empowerment pathway—including control over household resources, labour burden, caring capacity and practices and women’s energy expenditure.

Box 2. How to make agriculture and food systems investments more nutrition-sensitive?

1. Incorporate explicit **nutrition objectives and indicators** into their design and **track and mitigate potential harms**.
2. **Assess the context** at the local level to design appropriate activities to address the types and causes of malnutrition.
3. **Target the vulnerable and improve equity** through participation, access to resources and decent employment.
4. **Collaborate with other sectors** and programmes.
5. Maintain or improve the **natural resource base**.
6. **Empower women**
7. Facilitate production **diversification** and increase production of **nutrient-dense crops** and small-scale livestock.
8. **Improve processing, storage and preservation** to retain nutritional value and food safety, to reduce seasonality and post-harvest losses and to make healthy foods convenient to prepare.
9. **Expand market access for vulnerable groups**, particularly for marketing nutritious foods.
10. Incorporate **nutrition promotion and education**. (FAO, 2015)

Dr Wim Marivoet, Research Associate with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), introduced the **Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) typology**, a tool to identify and locate bottlenecks to inform policy aims around improving food and nutrition security. There are currently two models: i) Comprehensive typology for FNS Interventions and ii) Mapping Nutrient Adequacy for Targeted Policy Interventions. The first plots each country and/or region according to four indicators: agricultural potential, production, access and utilisation. The second classifies geographic areas according to their intervention types and magnitudes of food and nutrition constraints related to post-harvest losses, production, market and demand. In Burkina Faso, for example, the typology helped identify clusters of rural provinces that suffer mostly from production, access and utilisation inefficiencies. It revealed that there appears to be some degree of mistargeting for key agriculture investments.

Mr Komlan Kwadjode, Nutrition Consultant with FAO Senegal, presented possible **nutrition interventions along the food system**, organised into four core functions namely i) food production; ii) food handling, storage and processing, iii) food trade and marketing and iv) consumer demand, food preparation and consumer preferences. Each intervention has a ‘what’ (what is the definition of the intervention), ‘why’ (why does the intervention have a potential to improve nutrition) and ‘how’ (how do we make it more nutrition-sensitive). Important are required conditions for a conducive environment, in order for the intervention to improve nutrition outcomes effectively.

Discussion

The discussions following these presentations were around:

- **Why a food systems approach to nutrition:** We need to consider all factors and actors that can have an impact on nutrition, from farm to the fork. In food systems, there are many activities related to—and many individuals involved in—the production, processing, distribution and preparation of food, and these can positively or negatively influence nutrition. For example, the issue of food safety related to pesticides and fertilisers needs to be considered. Similarly, attention needs to be given to the different expectations and needs of customers (nutritious diets) and the food industry (profits). The challenge is, in some cases, needing to reconcile the two. This echoes the conflict issue raised in the group exercise and needs to be managed.

- **Reliability of the FNS typology tool and how it deals with dynamics:** The reliability of the methodology lies on the quality of data used and the triangulation of the data. Most recommendations from the analysis challenge development/humanitarian workers' intuitions and feelings, which are often the basis of programme development. The typology analysis does not take into consideration dynamics. It is a static picture but can be replicated over several years to have snapshots to give an idea of the dynamics.
- **Discussion around biofortification:** Biofortification, the breeding of staple crops which are richer in essential micronutrients than traditional varieties, has been shown to be a feasible and cost-effective approach to addressing micronutrient deficiencies in certain contexts, particularly for hard to reach populations. The exact definition of biofortification remains to be determined and specifications are not yet defined by the Codex Alimentarius: it is especially important to differentiate between conventional breeding and genetically modified organism (GMO) technologies, as many improved seeds (particularly most "biofortified" seeds) are not GMOs.

Session key messages

The drivers of nutrition are multi-faceted, and the pathways through which food systems can contribute to improve nutrition are complex. This calls for multisectoral solutions, including building strategic partnerships between several types of actors including the private sector. Whilst food systems have a lot of potential to improve nutrition, they are not presently geared towards healthy diets. Deliberate actions are needed at each function and activity of the food system, to enhance the contribution to improved nutrition outcomes. Basing decisions on evidence such as the Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) typology is critical to avoid inefficient policy decision or programme planning.

Session 3: Lessons learnt and good practices

This session presented the state of knowledge and existing evidence on food systems for nutrition, accompanied by highlights of country experience with relevant policy and programming in different aspects of the food system. As with the previous session, this session likely provided inspiration for the actions on "improve food systems interventions' potential to benefit nutrition" and "build the evidence base and strengthen its use in decision-making" agreed to later in the workshop.

Professor Thomas presented the current **evidence on food systems for improving nutrition**. According to the Global Panel, diets do not automatically improve over time and food systems are not intrinsically geared towards nutrition. In addition, as profit and nutrition do not automatically overlap, consumers have a co-responsibility for the choices they make in their immediate food environment. In addition, most populations in the Sahel region rely heavily on staple crops for their diets and livelihoods, and so there is a need to build more resilient food systems to deliver both healthy diets and healthy livelihoods. It is also important to identify ways of producing more nutrient-rich foods and to strengthen markets so that such food can move around more easily between districts and regions across countries and within the Sahel region. This requires a strong collaboration with the private sector. See Box 3 for the ten recommendations of the Global Panel foresight report.

Box 3. The 10 recommended policy actions of the Global Panel's Foresight report.

1. Focus **food system policies** on diet quality for infants and young children.
2. Improve **adolescent girl and adult women's** diet quality in all policy making that shapes food systems.
3. Ensure that food-based **dietary guidelines** ALSO guide policy decisions to reshape food systems.
4. **Animal source foods** provide important nutrients. Policy support for these foods should be pragmatically evidence-based rather than driven by ideology.
5. Make **fruits, vegetables, pulses, nuts and seeds** more available, affordable and safe for all.
6. Make policies on product **formulation, labelling, promotion** and **taxes** a priority.
7. Improve **accountability** at all levels—food system **metrics**.
8. **Break down barriers within governments** for dealing with the multisector problem.
9. **Institutionalise** high-quality diets through public sector purchasing power.
10. **Refocus agriculture research investments** globally to support healthy diets and good nutrition.

(Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems For Nutrition, 2016)

Discussion

The subsequent discussions were around:

- ***Impact of regulations to discourage unhealthy food; incentives for the private sector to promote better nutrition practices:*** Suggestions included finding a common understanding and a frank discussion; encouraging investment in small and medium enterprises; promoting consumer demand for healthy foods; and fostering dialogue to build trust between public and private sector and consumers. Companies may be risk-averse, and governments could help to incentivise these companies to take the needed risks.

In some countries, taxes on unhealthy foods are being introduced, though it is early to see the impact. Further, making the arguments for better nutrition through food systems is difficult because the evidence is only emerging. A strong argument could be made to look at the financial losses endured by doing nothing about nutrition and use examples of interventions that have worked. In Senegal, strong advocacy has been made for incentives (tax reduction) on iodised salt, but as the salt is also used for other non-food related purposes, there has been some challenge to the idea.

- ***Impact of advocacy efforts:*** The African Union took an important step in endorsing the African Leaders for Nutrition. A continental nutrition accountability scorecard has been developed to track country progress. This took a long, tough series of moves, similar to the advocacy effort around cigarettes.
- ***High-level policy discussions impact on a young girl living in a rural community:*** There is a big gap between government guidelines and what happens in households. The basis for community impact is food and nutrition behaviour change approaches. There are many examples of educating mothers and what they should be feeding their children but, schools, community initiatives and village chiefs should be involved as well.

Four programme experiences were presented, followed by a World Café, in which presenters had the opportunity to respond to participant questions and deepen discussions on the cases presented. During those discussions, participants and speakers from other sessions shared their experiences.

Mr Ibrahima Seck, National Federation of Organic Agriculture (FENAB), presented **Organic farming for better nutrition**, a position paper which considers the current government approach to agriculture

development, i.e. policy incoherence and high reliance on fertilisers and other pesticides, a major barrier to sustainable food systems for nutrition. Another barrier identified is the lack of alignment of agricultural research with smallholder farmer priorities. A more participatory research and policy setting agenda that promotes organic family farming and agrobiodiversity is recommended.

Ms Julie Vray, ACF Spain, shared **gardening for health**, an integrated, community-based, participatory approach that includes nutrition/health, food security and WASH with a strong gender analysis. Through an integrated support to food production, food processing, storage and other post-harvest management systems, the intervention has reduced malnutrition rates in Chad and has increased the dietary diversity score in Niger. Lessons learnt include the importance of acknowledging the roles and skills of existing local actors and integrating local knowledge and practices in the intervention as well as of fostering synergies between various sectors.

After a brief overview of trends in nutrition indicators in Senegal, Ms Seynabou Toure Laye, CLM, presented on **food systems for nutrition in national policy**, sharing the conceptual framework of Senegal's national multisectoral nutrition plan. The plan's third pillar relates to nutrition-sensitive food systems, via improved availability and accessibility of healthy, diverse and nutrient rich foods.

Dr Yves Martin-Prevel presented **an impact evaluation of a cash transfers programme** implemented by the government of Togo with the support of the World Bank and UNICEF. The programme consisted of a monthly cash transfer for pregnant women and mothers of children in five prefectures, associated with a package of nutrition services including the management of acute malnutrition, growth monitoring and nutrition counselling. The programme led to significant impact on health service attendance, prenatal care, prevalence of child illness, low birthweight and underweight. This suggested that social transfer programmes can be a powerful means to improve child and maternal nutrition, acting on the immediate and/or underlying causes of malnutrition.

Session key messages

Business and nutrition needs do not automatically overlap, and food system actors are responsible for their choices, e.g. producers and consumers in the Sahel depending so heavily on staples. Policy-makers need to make evidence-based decisions to transform the food system, to make safe, high-quality diets more available and affordable for infants, children, adolescents and women. This includes policy on safe inputs for production, labelling, tax and other incentives, demand promotion and other actions to strengthen local, national and regional markets for healthy foods. Government can also purchase high-quality diets for the vulnerable populations they serve through public-sector institutions. Further it can break down sectoral barriers to integrated, multisectoral approaches and build trust with the private sector. Global and regional institutions can also collaborate to prioritise such actions, and local actors can offer their skills, knowledge and influence to prioritise availability, accessibility, affordability and consumption of healthy, diverse and nutrient rich foods.

Session 4: Multi-stakeholder cooperation and coordination

The session focused on nutrition governance, including global commitments and frameworks and multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination for sustainable improvement in nutrition outcomes. It likely contributed to some of the participant-recommended actions around establishing alliances and strategic partnerships, strengthening dialogue and coordination and mobilising within agencies.

A joint presentation by MQSUN+, EU, DFID and French MOFA on **international and regional nutrition governance** used key landmarks of global initiatives leading to greater international mobilisation for nutrition. This started in 1992 with the (first) International Conference on Nutrition. Since the Sahel food crisis in 2005 and the publication of the 2006 World Bank report on “Repositioning nutrition as central to development: a strategy for large scale action”, several global nutrition initiatives, frameworks and commitments have emerged. These include amongst others, the SUN movement; the WHA 2025 targets for nutrition; development of SDG 2; the second international Conference on Nutrition (ICN2) and the 2016-2025 UN Decade of Action on Nutrition. In Africa, the Africa Union has developed the Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy 2016-2025 and the Malabo Declaration on Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). Many regional economic communities including Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) have developed nutrition strategies or policies. To support these global and regional efforts, many donors have developed specific frameworks for nutrition, e.g. the European Commission International Cooperation and Development (EC DEVCO) Action Plan on Nutrition, the French roadmap 2016-2020 on nutrition and the UK’s Global Nutrition Position Paper.

The facilitators presented **core principles and recommendations for an effective multisectoral system in nutrition** along with an example of application in decentralised settings. Thereafter, participants in groups identified relevant stakeholders involved in food systems for nutrition programming in government, UN agencies, civil society organisations, academia/research and business/private sector. They categorised key stakeholders based on their influence and interest on the national nutrition agenda. This categorisation is very important to identify key stakeholders to involve, define the stakeholder engagement approach and inform the advocacy strategy and formation of strategic partnerships. For example, it is important to secure commitment of stakeholders with a strong influence on the agenda. Various strategies can be used to raise their interest level if needed.

Discussion

The discussions from the presentations and the group work involved:

- ***Initiative alignment, global-level platform functionality and donor financing mechanisms:*** There are commonalities across the EU, French and UK frameworks in terms of objectives and focus on partnership and multisectoral approach to reduce stunting, for example. Efforts are also being made to facilitate coherence and synergies as evidenced by the current workshop. Donors and global actors should ensure that the platforms in which they engage are functional and have proper accountability mechanisms. Regarding financing, as examples, the MOFA has a funding tool for partners that is partly dedicated to support nutrition activities along with other food security and resilience interventions. DFID has a similar arrangement to support its nutrition commitments with some programmes targeting the private sector and/or specific country situations. The EU has programmes to fund bilateral and civil society partners’ nutrition actions.
- ***Co-existence of two separate national coordination platforms for food security and nutrition:*** This situation exists in many countries, these two platforms often have many of the same actors and increasingly there is a call to combine the platform under a neutral institution—such as the Office of the President, Vice President, Prime Minister, Ministry of Finance or Planning Commission—and then establish subcommittees or thematic working groups that deal with food security or nutrition. The existence of multisectoral platform(s) is not enough, it must be functional, effectively mainstream nutrition into sectoral plans and have clear accountability mechanisms.

- ***Subnational level platform institutional arrangement:*** These types of organisational issues exist at sub-national level as well. There is the question, as in the case of Senegal, as to whether it would be a more effective coordination platform if the Prefect or President of the departmental council hosts. Participants agreed that the decision on who should host depends on many factors, including a combination of leadership and commitment. In Yorosso (Mali), the options were the President of the Council or the Prefect, but the stakeholders proposed the latter because most stakeholders were accountable to the Prefect rather than to the President of the council. A decision matrix based on agreed criteria was developed from the experience in Burkina Faso to guide countries to decide on the best institutional anchorage for the platform.
- ***Enhancing the role of the private sector in the food systems for nutrition agenda:*** The private sector is an important actor whose potential has not been yet fully harnessed, in part because private sector interests and public/consumer nutrition needs do not necessarily align. In this situation, the public sector can provide incentives to encourage the private sector to move out of their comfort zones. There is also a lack of trust, “Big food” scares many, and so the private sector is often demonised. There have indeed been examples where the private sector has attempted to influence research and some businesses’ practices have been very negative for nutrition. Investing in building more trust is an important start. Part of Lawrence Haddad’s actions upon taking the helm at the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) have been about trying to change public perception and private sector practices in order to build trust. The SUN Movement and the Food Systems Dialogues have also fostered dialogue. The Access to Nutrition Index (ATNI) was developed to measure private sector contribution to better nutrition, identify areas of improvement and incentivise businesses to do more in tackling obesity and undernutrition. In general, there is improvement and many food companies are trying to change their practices towards healthier products. Still, the efforts of the private sector does not benefit the most vulnerable, it is extremely important to establish dialogue between the private sector, the public sector and consumers. Sometimes, consumer pressure can be catalytic for a change in the private sector approach.
- ***Enhancing the role of women in the food systems for nutrition agenda:*** Most women in rural areas are still struggling with cultural norms and this is affecting their diets. There are some strong leaders, like Graca Machel and the first ladies of Ghana and Ethiopia, who are championing nutrition in their respective countries and in Africa as a whole. However, though the role of women is essential, there is a danger in always simplifying that all progress in Africa should be through women. In fact, women already have a lot of responsibilities, and there are sometimes limits on what they can do given their position in society, e.g. in some circumstances having to hide to uptake family planning actions. We need to take into account social and cultural norms when programming – whilst deploying gender transformative actions to reach gender equality.

Session key messages

There is a global momentum for food systems for nutrition with a conducive global environment supported by donors, such as the French MOFA and DFID. However, there is a need to accelerate efforts through innovative and fast-tracking of interventions and actions. This will also involve, amongst other challenges, the need to increase coherence between donor interventions and national plans and strategies, fulfilling the global funding commitments, engaging stakeholders within countries to champion the agenda, developing effective mutual accountability for better governance, streamlining structures (e.g. a food security and a nutrition platform both existing, subnational hosting) and establishing strategic partnerships amongst donors and other partners. The

private sector could participate positively in the food systems for nutrition agenda, particularly if we look at mutual interests. Women already have an active role and we need to look at how to ensure gender equity in participating in this agenda.

Session 5: Tracking progress and measuring results

In this session, participants learnt about how donors are reporting on nutrition, as well as indicators to track progress and measure nutrition impact at different levels of the food system. It highlighted the types of indicators development advisors should prioritise when selecting projects and overseeing operations.

The MOFA shared about the **new policy marker for nutrition in the OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS)**, which aims at improving the reporting and monitoring of multisectoral and crosscutting nutrition investments by all donors. The introduction of this marker was necessary because the “basic nutrition” marker code (12240) was inefficient in capturing total aid for nutrition due to the multisectoral and crosscutting nature of nutrition. Tracking based on the “basic nutrition” code was not aligned with the SUN Donor Network or the G7 Food Security Working Group methodologies. The new marker will be rolled-out gradually, but all donors should comply by 2020.

Dr Elodie Becquey, IFPRI Research Fellow revisited the agriculture to nutrition pathways and described the different **indicators for use at different levels of the food system, from production to consumer levels**. A review completed by IFPRI demonstrated that agriculture and food systems for nutrition intervention can improve dietary and nutrition related indicators, but impact on stunting is difficult to demonstrate (Ruel, Quisumbing and Balagamwala, 2018). She shared, using the example of the “Creating Homestead Agriculture for Nutrition and Gender Equity (CHANGE)” project in Tanzania, some key steps and recommendations for selecting indicators at different levels to monitor interventions and track progress (Box 4).

Box 4. Recommendations for actors planning to document the impact of agriculture investments on nutrition.

- Make sure the collection of indicators is adequately included in the programme or project investment plan because it has a cost.
- Plan to measure the impact and select indicators relevant to your programme impact pathways and along the whole results chain (inputs/outputs, outcomes, impacts).
- Focus on improving access/intake of high-quality diets for all household members rather than reducing stunting.
- Choose to have a control group whenever possible.
- Take gender into account when measuring indicators, i.e. measure for both men and women and disaggregate results by gender.
- Take seasonality into account in indicator selection and interpretation.
- Measure indicators through several channels (national surveys, household surveys, market surveys, environmental surveys, etc.).
- Consider the strength of an indicator when considering its selection and interpretation (e.g. declared vs observed vs biologic).
- Consider measuring potentially adverse impacts (e.g. contamination of foods with pesticides, contamination of the environment with poultry faeces, etc.).

An overview of the FAO compendium of indicators for nutrition-sensitive agriculture and important considerations on the use of the compendium was also presented, with specific attention to key entry points for nutrition-sensitive agriculture (FAO, 2016).

Discussion

Following these presentations, the key questions were around:

- *Use of biological indicators:* These are costly and should not be the primary target for assessing nutrition-sensitive agriculture and food systems.
- *Coordination in indicator selection:* Dialogue should be strengthened between programme designers, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) experts and programme implementers to enable better selection of indicators.

Session key messages

The new OECD DAC marker on nutrition will be rolled-out gradually but all donors should comply by 2020. The marker will provide greater accountability and transparency through publicly available data for donors, researchers and civil society. For the first time, donors will be able to systematically track how their nutrition funding—nutrition-specific and sensitive—is integrated across all sectoral portfolios. Advisors should look at how their projects might align. Regarding indicators, whilst there are many indicators to choose from, agriculture and food system actors should prioritise realistic indicators all along the results chain. These should be most likely related to access to (or intake of) high-quality diets as the endpoint, as indicators such as stunting are hard to change and are distal from the priorities of most food system actors. Sex-disaggregated data should be collected where possible and seasonality should be considered. Adverse outcomes and impacts should be measured as well. Indicators aligned to the SDGs and the CAADP should be considered, as countries must report on those regularly. Different stakeholders should collaborate in the selection of indicators to ensure relevance, feasibility and resourcing.

Session 6: My actions on food systems for nutrition

Building on knowledge from previous sessions, participants identified current and upcoming opportunities at global and country levels and concrete action they can take to better support food systems for nutrition programming in their respective organisations and positions. The key proposed actions can be summarised as follows:

1. Build evidence base and strengthen its use in decision-making.
2. Establish strategic alliances and partnerships to create and maintain momentum, inspire and catalyse action, including advocacy for stronger local government commitment for nutrition.
3. Strengthen stakeholder dialogue, stronger cooperation and coordination amongst donors and with different actors, including governments.
4. Raise awareness and advocate for more internal mainstreaming of nutrition within participating agency development and humanitarian programming.
5. Enhance the potential of food system projects and programmes to improve nutrition outcomes.

These action areas and recommendations are presented in the workshop outcome document (see Annex 2).

Some participants also wrote (Box 5) the steps they will individually take as follow-up.

Box 5. Proposed short-term actions participants committed to take as a follow-up to the workshop.

- Sharing of the main outcomes of the workshop with colleagues.
- Sensitisation of managers and ambassadors on the importance and benefits of investing in nutrition.
- Advocacy for more emphasis on nutrition on the development partner agenda of my country of assignment.
- Better involvement in the country SUN platform, particularly the donor platform.
- Internal mainstreaming of nutrition in pipeline and upcoming projects and programmes.

Session 7: Concluding remarks

Ms Heidi Gilert, DFID Humanitarian Advisor and Ms Nawal Chahid, French MOFA, thanked participants, speakers and facilitators for taking part in the workshop, which they saw as an opportunity to increase understanding of these issues and to gather some good practices and lessons learned. Both institutions will explore how their staff can use this in their daily work. They also noted the opportunity for the UK and French governments to create synergies for better nutrition and food systems programming in the Sahel, as clearly experience sharing and more coordination across sectors and stakeholders are beneficial. There is a need to support increased availability and accessibility of healthy and diversified foods for the most vulnerable in the region, whilst being realistic about the impacts on nutrition to be expected and being careful to select appropriate indicators to demonstrate change. They also noted a need for specific focus on women in food systems for nutrition, in order to accelerate progress. Finally, they called for participants to seize upcoming opportunities to strengthen food systems on the nutrition agenda, such as the 2020 Tokyo nutrition for growth summit, and recognized the UK and French commitment to work with governments and all partners to eliminate malnutrition in the Sahel.

MQSUN+ Post-script

Nutrition is a major development challenge and multisectoral partnerships are needed in order to accelerate achievement of the SDGs and regional targets. Overall, there is a global momentum for food systems for nutrition, supported by donors such the French MOFA and DFID. However, food systems are not presently geared towards healthy diets. Deliberate actions are needed at each food system function and activity to enhance the contribution to improved nutrition outcomes. Policy-makers need to make evidence-based decisions to support food system to make safe, diversified and healthy diets for infants, children, adolescents and women more available and affordable. Trust needs to be built with the private sector and barriers to integrated, multisectoral approaches shall be broken down. Coordination needs strengthening at national and subnational levels whilst also engaging local actors to use their skills, knowledge and influence to prioritise availability, accessibility, affordability and consumption of healthy, diverse and nutrient rich foods. Women have an important role in this regard, and we must ensure equity in the food systems agenda. Gender was

considered throughout planning and facilitating the workshop, from speaker and participant identification to technical content of the sessions.

In terms of monitoring and measuring progress, the new OECD DAC marker on nutrition marks significant progress. Despite a plethora of indicators, we should prioritise realistic indicators along the food system results chain, likely having access to (or intake of) high-quality diets as the endpoint, given that anthropometric outcomes will be a bit distal from the priorities of most food system actors, and are, in fact, being collected by others. Sex-disaggregated data should be collected, seasonality should be considered and adverse outcomes and impacts should be measured as well.

There was a focus on the private sector contribution to food systems for nutrition. Because of the perceived diverging interests between the private sector and nutrition goals, there is a need for deliberate actions to foster dialogue and build trust towards positive involvement of the private sector in the food systems for nutrition actions. This is the only way we will be able to fully harness the important potential of the private sector, which is necessary given that most food systems actors are private. This will require support and incentives from donors and governments.

A particular feature of the workshop was the diversity of actors represented in both the speakers and participants, which helps concretely illustrate a multisectoral dialogue. Speakers were from civil society (local and international), research institutions, UN agencies, government, etc. with expertise in various sectors such as agriculture, food security and health. The importance of multi-stakeholder coordination and mutual accountability was stressed as a key factor for sustainable improvement, perhaps more so for food systems for nutrition than in other areas of nutrition. Strategic partnerships, to speak with one voice at the national level and in global fora, are needed to foster government and other partners' contributions to the food system for nutrition agenda.

Whilst participants improved their knowledge and skills related to food systems and nutrition programming, their work takes place in an environment with other colleagues. Participants may appreciate follow-up support and resources to facilitate internal advocacy and mainstreaming of food systems for nutrition in their day to day work. In fact, one suggestion was to develop documents with key statistics and key concepts so that these could be used in such advocacy.

In their evaluations, participants indicated they were pleased with the workshop, found the agenda relevant, found the workshop theme relevant to their work and enjoyed the opportunity to network in the region on this topic. They also recommended for the future, more of a focus on how these issues are pursued at the humanitarian/development nexus; more attention on the livestock sector, the linkage with sustainable farming and the one health approach; using lessons learned from other thematic areas such as HIV and tuberculosis, which are also crosscutting; more emphasis on the negative impacts of food systems on nutrition; and the impact of globalisation (for example, imported products) on food systems and nutrition.

References

- African Development Bank Group, Big Win Philanthropy, & A. D. F. (2018) *Banking on Nutrition: Harnessing “Grey Matter Infrastructure” to Unlock the Human and Economic Potential of Africa*. Available at: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Generic-Documents/Banking_on_Nutrition_A4_V1_single.pdf (Accessed: 27 December 2018).
- DFID (2008) *The neglected crisis of undernutrition: Evidence for action from the Department for International Development* *The neglected crisis of undernutrition: Evidence for action*. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67717/nutrition-evidence-paper.pdf (Accessed: 27 December 2018).
- DFID UK (2017) *Saving lives, investing in future generations and building prosperity-the UK’s Global Nutrition Position Paper*. London, UK. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/652122/nutrition-paper-2017a.pdf.
- FAO (2015) *Key Recommendations for Improving Nutrition Through Agriculture and Food Systems*. Available at: www.fao.org/docrep/017/aq194e/aq194e00.htm (Accessed: 27 February 2019).
- FAO (2016) *Compendium of indicators for nutrition-sensitive agriculture*. Rome.
- FAO & WHO (2014) *Second International Conference on Nutrition, Conference Outcome Document: Rome Declaration on Nutrition*. Rome. Available at: www.fao.org (Accessed: 19 March 2019).
- GBD 2016 Causes of Death Collaborators (2017) *Global, regional, and national age-sex specific mortality for 264 causes of death, 1980–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016*, *The Lancet*. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32152-9.
- Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems For Nutrition (2016) *Food systems and diets: Facing the challenges of the 21st century*. Available at: <http://glopan.org/sites/default/files/ForesightReport.pdf> (Accessed: 27 February 2019).
- High Level Panel of Experts (2017) *Nutrition and Food Systems: A report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security*. Rome. Available at: www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe (Accessed: 7 December 2018).
- IFPRI (2014) *2014 Global Nutrition Report: Actions and Accountability to Accelerate the World’s Progress on Nutrition*. Washington, DC.
- IFPRI (2016) *2016 Global Nutrition Report - From Promise to Impact: Ending Malnutrition by 2030*. Washington D.C. doi: 10.2499/9780896295841.
- Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group (2013) ‘Executive Summary of the Lancet Maternal and Child Nutrition Series’, *The Lancet*, pp. 1–12. Available at: <http://www.thelancet.com/pb/assets/raw/Lancet/stories/series/nutrition-eng.pdf> (Accessed: 18 September 2017).
- Ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Développement International (2016) ‘La Nutrition Des Populations Vulnérables: Feuille de route pour l’action de la France à l’international 2016-2020’.
- Ruel, M. T., Quisumbing, A. R. and Balagamwala, M. (2018) ‘Nutrition-sensitive agriculture: What have we learned so far?’ doi: 10.1016/j.gfs.2018.01.002.
- Shekar, M. et al. (2017) *An Investment Framework for Nutrition: Reaching the Global Targets for Stunting, Anemia, Breastfeeding, and Wasting*. The World Bank. doi: 10.1596/978-1-4648-1010-7.
- UN General Assembly (2015) ‘Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’, in *UNGA Resolution A/RES/70/1 of 25 September 2015*, pp. 1–35. doi: 10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2.

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda

Day 1: Monday, 28 January 2019

Time	Activity	Speaker
Opening		
08:00-08:30	Registration	
08:30-09:00	Opening remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mr. Luc Briard, First Counsellor of the Embassy of France in Senegal – H.E. George Hodgson, British Ambassador to Senegal 	Jean Pierre Lamarque, MOFA Senegal Mr. Luc Briard, French Embassy, Senegal H.E. George Hodgson, British Embassy, Senegal
09:00-09:30	Objectives, agenda and ground rules (Presentation)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+
09:30-10:00	Break	
Session 1: Setting the scene		
10:00-10:30	Malnutrition—Definition and different forms (Presentation)	Yves Martin-Prevel
10:30-11:45	Nutrition context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Nutrition situation in the Sahel Region – Why invest in nutrition – Nutrition financing – Discussion 	Noel Zagre, UNICEF Sandy Thomas, Global Panel Claire Chastre, MQSUN+
11:45-12:30	Knowledge and perceived barriers/challenges for food systems for nutrition programming (Plenary discussion of participant perceptions)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
Session 2: Causal pathways and response analysis		
13:30-14:15	Improving nutrition through food systems—Key concepts and principles (Presentation)	Yves Martin-Prevel, IRD
14:15-16:00	Identifying entry points for food systems for improving nutrition in the Sahel (Presentation) Mapping nutrient adequacies (Presentation)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+ Wim Marivoet, IFPRI
16:00-16:15	Break	
16:15-17:15	Nutrition interventions along the food system —processes and infrastructure (Presentation)	Komlan Kwadjode, FAO
17:15-17:30	Wrap up of day 1	

Day 2: Tuesday, 29 January 2019

Time	Activity	Speaker
Session 3: Lessons learnt and good practices		
08:30-09:30	What have we learnt —Existing research and evidence for improving nutrition through agriculture and food systems (Presentation)	Sandy Thomas, Global Panel
09:30-11:30 (including 15 min break)	Country/ stakeholder experience on optimising food systems for nutrition – Rapid sharing from a few speakers, 5-6 minutes each (Presentations) – Country experiences—deepening discussion on country experiences and suggestions for improvement from other participants (World Café)	Ibrahima Seck, FENAB Julie Vray, ACF Seynabou Toure Laye, CLM Yves Martin-Prevel, IRD
Session 4: Multi-stakeholder cooperation and coordination		
11:30-12:45	International and regional nutrition governance —including global and Africa regional nutrition and food systems frameworks including of DFID, MOFA, EC and OECD (Presentation)	Claire Chastre, MQSUN+ Anna da Palma, DFID Nawal Chahid, MOFA
12:45-13:45	Lunch	
13:45-15:15	Working across sectors to improve nutrition at national level – Multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination in nutrition (Presentation) – Identification/mapping of nutrition stakeholders (Group work)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+
15:15-15:30	Break	
Session 5: Tracking progress and measuring results		
15:30-17:15	– OECD Nutrition marker – Nutrition-sensitive agriculture indicators along the result chain, i.e. process/output/outcome/impact (Presentation) – Key considerations for selecting indicators from the FAO compendium	Nawal Chahid, MOFA Elodie Becquey, IFPRI Dia Sanou, MQSUN+
17:15-17:30	– Wrap up of day 2	

Day 3: Wednesday, 30 January 2019

Time	Activity	Speaker
08:30-09:00	Questions & Answers (Open Discussion)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+
Session 6: My actions for food systems for nutrition		
09:00-11:45 (including 15 min break)	Concrete actions to strengthen the integration of nutrition into day-to-day work in agriculture/food systems development and humanitarian programming (Group exercise)	Claire Chastre, MQSUN+
11:45-12:15	Workshop evaluation and individual commitments (Exercise)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+
Session 7: Conclusion and way forward		
12:15-13:00	Conclusion and way forward: closing remarks with a panel discussion on recommendations and follow-up actions (Presentation)	Dia Sanou, MQSUN+ Claire Chastre, MQSUN+ Anna da Palma, DFID Nawal Chahid, MOFA
13:00-14:00	Lunch	

Annex 2: Actions Recommended for Participants

Topic	Recommended action
Build the evidence base and strengthen its use in decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further disseminate and promote the use of existing evidence and publications such as the briefs from the Global Panel on Agriculture and Food Systems for Nutrition (Global Panel). • Further build the evidence on the value of addressing malnutrition for human capital development (e.g. country-level cost of hunger data) and approaches to doing this. • Compile information on the costs of interventions and ensuring nutrition-sensitivity in various domains (e.g. nutrition-sensitive value-chains, nutrition-sensitive health sector). • Share experience and successful tools for designing nutrition-sensitive programmes. • Combine humanitarian and development data (e.g. food security, health, climate, nutrient adequacies) to build a more complete picture of linkages and to prioritise actions. • Promote local governments' leadership on evidence-generation activities, to ensure greater ownership of results (supporting capacities and quality assurance as needed).
Establish alliances and strategic partnerships	<p>Private sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the relevant departments in-house to mobilise the private sector, including facilitate its participation with the SBN. • Engage with a wide range of actors (including farmers) in the private sector at every level of the food system and value chain (e.g. production, processing, packaging, marketing). • Reflect on how to engage the private sector in a win-win (nutrition benefits and profits). • Collaborate with businesses wishing to improve their image by investing in human capital. • More systematically integrate the 'shaming' approach (i.e. shaming companies which perform poorly in nutrition terms) to behaviour change approaches so that consumers are better informed and able to claim their rights. • Leverage opportunities from regional trade. <p>Visibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to international nutrition events (e.g. the Tokyo 2020 Global Nutrition Summit). • Bring nutrition to the agenda of other international events (e.g. G7 Summit and Olympics). • Disseminate key messages through factsheets, via the press or at meetings (e.g. embassies can take these messages to ministers). • Develop joint declarations on these issues together with other actors at country level. • Facilitate civil society advocacy so that nutrition remains an investment priority. • Collaborate on opportunities to increase demand for nutritious diets. • Contribute actively to the SUN movement as it engages in these issues. <p>Government leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support civil society in its role to hold governments accountable, e.g. monitoring government funding for nutrition. • Leverage networks to bring greater commitment for nutrition, e.g. Global Panel helped establish African Leaders for Nutrition (ALN) to secure commitments from Heads of State. • Support national governments in long term planning and tracking of progress in nutrition.

Topic	Recommended action
Strengthen dialogue and coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map actors and existing networks, to understand roles and scope, identify gaps and overlaps in informing synergy and identify effective coordination mechanisms. • Take advantage of existing coordination mechanisms (e.g. the Gambia multi-stakeholder platform) and ensure they support operational commitments. • In the absence of an existing one, support the creation of a coordination platform. • Involve actors which do not necessarily have a presence in-country (e.g. ECHO) in the dialogue. • Integrate nutrition and food systems issues into the dialogues amongst and between global and national counterparts (in line with Article 8 of the Cotonou Agreement). • Leverage the mandate, role and position of each agency to strengthen coordination, e.g. a government can call meetings of its nationals, donors can liaise with donors. • Further contribute to coordination and strengthen collaboration at regional level. • Establish clear roles and responsibilities to ensure the agenda moves forward, transparently in a coordinated manner. • Leverage food systems-for-nutrition for humanitarian / development coordination. • Overcome the barriers between humanitarian and development actions, even beyond the nexus approach. • Support the implementation of the SUN Movement evaluation recommendations. • Intensify involvement in donor coordination, e.g. ask Ministry of Planning to organise an agriculture/nutrition group amongst donors, to support nutrition-sensitive food systems.
Mobilise within participating agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief colleagues about this workshop and what was learnt, determining key messages to be disseminated internally, targeting the most strategic teams/directorates as a priority. • Develop factsheets/roadmaps presenting current actions and future opportunities. • Conduct and disseminate a mapping of the actors involved in nutrition and food systems. • Designate focal points in strategic units who can speak to nutrition in food systems. • Integrate nutrition and food systems issues into regular management and other meetings. • Offer capacity building on food systems and nutrition; integrate into existing trainings.
Improve food systems interventions' potential to benefit nutrition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematically identify opportunities for food systems interventions to benefit nutrition, e.g. value chain approaches can operate alongside social protection schemes. • Work with governments to turn commitments into actions (e.g. support land reform and advocate for National Agricultural Infrastructure Programme [NAIP] to benefit smallholders). • Consider innovative approaches (e.g. certifying nutritious products to build markets). • Support behaviour change approaches to create consumer demand for nutritious diets. • Consider the context of climate change and support development of small infrastructure improvements in production and distribution of nutritious food (e.g. for cold chains). • Coordinate in this area to ensure the right interventions reach the most vulnerable. • Be realistic when setting objectives and targets, as food systems for nutrition is a new area.