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Pre-emergency Nutrition Cluster coordination structure
Humanitarian response and linkage with the MOH

• Humanitarian Responses is coordinated by the nutrition cluster housed in UNICEF
• Nutrition activities (SUN, Guidelines, policies) at national level are coordinated by the MOH through the Nutrition Unit

Linkage with MOH
• MOH prepares Annual work plan that include both development and emergency
• Quarterly/bi-annual reviews are conducted by the MOH
• Cluster Annual Work Plan and updates to the MOH provided regularly
• MOH part of the cluster coordinated TWGs under cluster
Preparedness plan and implementation strategy

• Pre-crisis (Famine)

  • Relying on OCHA preparedness and implementation- nutrition cluster contributes with respect to prioritized locations.
  • Relying on UNICEF and WFP preparedness and implementation strategy.

• Post crisis: (Famine)

  • Cluster determined to prepare its own Preparedness and implementation strategy with consensus from all partners.
South Sudan context (complex emergency)

- Ongoing and spreading conflict in more states since 2013
- Wide spread acute malnutrition - situation worsening for last three years
- Increased severe food insecurity in the last three years, up to 50% of population in May 2017
- High prevalence of morbidities (malaria, AWD, cholera outbreak) associated with limited access to health services
- Economic crisis associated with high inflation, collapsing of markets
- Insecurity and limited access for humanitarian workers and increasing levels of criminality- disrupting supply networks, looting of humanitarian supplies
- Ever growing humanitarian needs in all sectors compounded with ever growing bureaucratic challenges
Broader emergency nutrition priorities

• Provision of life saving management of acute malnutrition to at least 75% of SAM and 60% of MAM burdens among children; 60% of PLW and 60% of the elderly in the PoC

• Increased access to preventive nutrition services to the most vulnerable and at risk (IYCF 60%; BSFP <5s-30%; BSFP PLW-20%) mainly in conflict and high burden states

• Enhanced needs analysis of nutrition situation and ensure robust monitoring and coordination of emergency nutrition responses.

• Increased access to integrated nutrition, health and WASH FSL activities in counties with critical levels of global acute malnutrition \((GAM \geq 15\%)\)
### Achievement Jan – August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>People in need</th>
<th>Cluster Target</th>
<th>New Admission</th>
<th>Achieved Vs People in Need</th>
<th>Achieved Vs Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>273,624</td>
<td>205,218</td>
<td>140,774</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAM</td>
<td>835,348</td>
<td>501,209</td>
<td>296,293</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLW</td>
<td>339,053</td>
<td>203,432</td>
<td>207,823</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSFP (&lt;5s)</td>
<td>1,453,081</td>
<td>435,924/729,623</td>
<td>628,234</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>144%/86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSFP (PLW)</td>
<td>592,916</td>
<td>118,583/285,371</td>
<td>161,748</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>136%/57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SAM Admission</th>
<th>MAM Admission</th>
<th>Total Admission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Aug 2016</td>
<td>158432</td>
<td>208623</td>
<td>367055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Aug 2017</td>
<td>140,774</td>
<td>296,293</td>
<td>437067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% changes in admission</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less SAM in 2017 associated with consistent good coverage of TSFP services from January to date. Additional 8 counties were reached with BSFP in CES and EES. Cluster/WFP revising the BSFP target. Overall, 19% more SAM and MAM combined beneficiaries were enrolled in OTP and TSFP in 2017 than it was in 2016.
Country buy-in process

• Partners briefed of the Rome call for action.
• Cluster lead agencies (UNICEF/FAO/WFP) briefed
• Health/WASH/Education CC briefed
• Call for action 16 points shared with all partners
• Nutrition and FSL CCs jointly drafted the action plan, health and WASH involved
• Draft action plan discussed with WFP/UNICEF/FAO
• Field visit conducted to collect inputs-FSL
• Joint nutrition and FSL 120 partners meeting approved the action plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Action plan (May to Dec 2017)</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise existing FSL and FSNMS methodology</td>
<td>FSL information being and partly nutrition (4-SMART ) collected at county level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of partners and government staff on FSNMs assessment</td>
<td>492 (Govt, FSL and nutrition) enumerators trained including 70 trained on detailed FS analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor presence and functionality of services (Health, WASH, nutrition,</td>
<td>Reinforced for nutrition on monthly as it existed before. Nutrition Gap revised now covering other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement integrated famine prevention package:</td>
<td>Scaled up integrated responses: Famine contained and prevented from Spreading to other counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizing UNICEF/RRM and OCHA coordinated ICRM missions</td>
<td>Joint review meeting RRM and ICRM done and UNICEF/WFP/OCHA meeting held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting GFD as opposed to blanket approach</td>
<td>In progress - in kind to CASH from unconditional to conditional being tried and targeted GFD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actions plan and Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Action plan (May to Dec 2017)</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting localized analysis framework for prepare index of severity</td>
<td>REACH has developed an early warning tool informing the IPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop an integrated response plan (WASH/Health/FSL/Nutrition)</strong></td>
<td>Consensus of having integrated response plan reached. Moved to Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify IPC 4 where integrated responses should be implemented.</td>
<td>Agreed with FSL,WASH and Health CCs and all partners to prioritize IPC 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale up of food and nutrition integrated responses.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for flexible, timely, multi-sector, multi-year funding</td>
<td>Done by nutrition cluster and FSL coordinators. More advocacy needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

- Seen as top down - Initiated and driven by the HQ
- Implementation of action plan increasing workload to already existing HRP plan
- Limited funding for some of the clusters eg WASH (20%, Health 17%, Nutrition 62.5%, FSL 73%)
- Over ambitious (many actions within a short time)
- Donor fatigue - increased need vs shrinking resources
- Funding both development and emergency response (short term and reactive)
Context & lessons learned

• Famine situation can be prevented and/or reversed with **multiple responses** within a short period (4-month)

• Good analysis and triangulation of food security and nutrition information is key in declaring famine

• Involvement of country offices in development of the initiative fosters ownership

• Pre-existing collaboration with other clusters was enriched by the new impetus on integration.

• Partnership = building friendly working relationship, trust, transparency
Next steps

• Development of integrated response plan by Dec 2017

• Continued advocacy of adequate funding for the four clusters planning to implement an integrated response plan

• Revising the action plan and timeline

• Integrating the action plan into the cluster AWP where appropriate
Reflections (did the Rome call made any difference?)

• Need for working together back on the agenda esp (WASH/Health, FSL and Nutrition)
• Increased understanding of the value of partnership
• Building relationships and believing in synergies of integrated responses
• Donors understood and supported the need for working together/integration.
• The need for timely response including developing an composite index for to guide early response based on early warning information
• Devising strategies for improving quality of nutrition services
Global asks

• Advocacy and provide technical support in the development of an integrated response plan for the four clusters
• Continued advocacy for adequate funding for the four clusters, otherwise, the call for an integrated response will be futile.
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