

Venue: Brackenhurst Conference Centre, Limuru, Kenya
Dates: 21 - 24 August 2012
Delivered to: 42 Participants
Facilitators/trainers: Linda Richardson (Consultant Facilitator); Paul Rees-Thomas (Nutrition Consultant)
Additional support: Brenda Akwany (Nutrition Sector Coordinator); Kibet (M&E officer - Unicef) Patrick lavad'homme(OCHA)

Introduction

This 3-day Nutrition Sector Coordination course was supported by the Global Nutrition Cluster, and organised by the Nutrition Sector Coordinator, and RedR UK.

The course objectives are to:

- Understand the background to Humanitarian Reform and the importance of coordination, and Kenyan coordination mechanisms;
- Be clear on the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the government, and partners at national and sub-national levels
- Be familiar with actions to engage Nutrition partners in a practical, coordinated way from early response to exit
- Recognise and be able to demonstrate, the attitude, skills and behaviours needed to support effective coordination and partnership;
- Have developed practical plans for improving coordination at national and sub-national levels in 2012 and beyond.

In line with the anticipated devolved system of government which will be rollout in Kenya after the election process in March 2013, the nutrition technical forum agreed to prioritize the first nutrition sector coordination training on the sub national government nutrition staff (15), Nutrition support officers that UNICEF has employed to support those government staff (17) to ensure effective county coordination structure are established by march 2013.

A backstopping team from the National Ministry of Public health- division of nutrition staff (5) representing the different national programs, Unicef Kenya(5), WFP(1) Kenya red cross Society(2) and USAID(1) were also represented.

Overall course comment

The course was very positively received by all, with an exceptionally high overall rating of 4.32 (out of 5). Participants found it useful and informative.

The highest scoring sessions were *Effective Meeting Skills* (4.59), *Collaborative Leadership and Coordination* (4.41), *Niangoma Simulation meeting* (4.38) *Roles and Responsibilities* (4.31)). The relevance to participants' roles and practical nature of these sessions appeared to be strong reasons for this. The most repeated recommendation for improvement was a request for more time. A session-by-session review is attached.

The Course Participants, for the first time were solely MoH and UNICEF support staff, this had consequences in terms of targeting sessions more precisely to their needs and professional roles as well as requiring the facilitators to ensure that broader partners views were considered and included. On reflection, this is a reason why additional time in-country to work with local presenters would have been helpful.

A strong emphasis was put on identifying practical actions which could be taken by the sector to improve coordination, and a summary of these points is shared in the appendix.

The Division of Nutrition staff /UNICEF and Participants expressed a desire to ensure that this training was also rolled out to sub-national level. This was particularly deemed to be crucial due to the devolution of powers and authority to the County. An initiative that is currently on-going within Kenya.

The broad geographical scope of the participants was positive, although the total number of participants made sufficient levels of engagement and feedback challenging, hence the recommendation below to limit numbers to 30 (ideal 25).

Linda Richardson and Paul Rees-Thomas

	Session title/outline	Av. Max 5	Comments from participants and feedback from facilitators	Suggested actions
Pre-course preparation			This training was different for other countries as the participants were drawn from government DNOs and their counter-part DSOs who are employed by UNICEF. There were no NGO partners present. The numbers (up to 42) were high, which put considerable pressure on time for discussions and feedback.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The facilitators would recommend that future training limits numbers to a maximum of 30 (ideally 25), or the training is extended to allow time for in-depth discussions.
DAY 1 - Setting the context				
1.1	Welcome and introductions	4.18		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfortunately the Director of Nutrition (GoK) was unable to attend until late morning, though her input was valued by the participants.
1.2	Humanitarian Reform and Coordination	4.07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>more focus on the current coordination model;</i> <i>complicated - should have been simplified;</i> <i>it was good to know what happening but session was no very clear,</i> <i>more time because it is a bit complicated</i> This session included an introduction to the Kenyan Coordination history by OCHA. Unfortunately, this was felt to be rather complex and confusing by some participants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More preparation time with the co-presenter would have been useful, so ensure clear messages. As argued in each report, more in-country preparation time would be key with major stakeholders such as senior OCHA reps. This would also encourage buy-in for inter-sector days which tend overall to be less well participated in.
1.3	Kenyan Coordination Structures	3.68	This session had the lowest rating though this was still a positive outcome. There were useful recommendations which were captured (see appendix)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The situation is in a state of flux at the moment with devolution, and so perhaps a clearer focus on either the current challenges or the future structures would have been useful.
1.4	Roles, responsibilities of Nutrition sector	4.31	This session straddled lunch, and some time was lost as the Director of Nutrition arrived to give the Welcome address. It was a positive and worthwhile exercise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes made to the programme seemed to work and gave more time for discussions. Identifying local focal points and 'mechanism' or 'forum' chairpersons to present would aid the precision of this session.
1.5	Challenges of Collaborative Leadership & Coordination	4.41	2 nd highest scoring session. Skills sessions were particularly appreciated as this offered new insights to participants.	
1.7	Effective meeting skills	4.59	Highest score.	
Overview of Day 1: (average score 4.20)				
The day was well received overall with positive feedback on learning. We had to manage larger numbers than anticipated, and some 'coming and going' of participants which was challenging. However, overall the day worked well.				
DAY 2 - Setting standards and good practice				
2.2	Consensus building and managing conflict	4.29	Inter-personal skills were generally well received.	
2.3	Managing Coordination Meeting - role play	4.38	This simulation was well received. All 3 meetings were very different, but all seemed to identify actions to take to improve their own meetings	
2.4	Developing Partnerships	4.29		
2.5	Setting standards and Cross Cutting Issues	3.72	<i>session was too rushed (cross-cutting) - almost didn't make sense</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At short notice, 2 presenters arrived to present on Cross Cutting Issues. Unfortunately this session was rather rushed, and this affected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation and inclusion of Sector Leads as well as Tech Working Group members would improve the discussions, though standards on their own still require the two hour slot.

			the rating. • However, standards are very national specific and practitioners of the participants' level are affected hugely by the current issues, so this is a key session	• Some jiggling of time, priorities, methods could be examined here.
2.6	Inter-sector coordination	4.10	This session was given more time, and included a simulation which was well received.	•
Overview of Day 2: (average 4.16) The balance of time on this day was improved by moving Field Realities				
DAY 3 - Planning and action				
3.1	Field realities	4.07	<i>Time was short</i> Moving this session to this slot seemed to work. The time was short, but drew out some useful and interesting experiences.	•
3.2	Information Management	4.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>most of my questions were answered - session was informative;</i> • <i>will improve data management and information dissemination and utilisation among all players</i> The introduction to the session was presented by Kibet, Info Manager, Kenya Nutrition Sector. It was focused and relevant. This is a very good score for an IM session. This was improved over previous sessions primarily due to time spent working to ensure specific and relevant questions for the participants.	• On reflection, being able to ensure the questions were specific to the entire audience was also a result of the homogeneity of the participants; i.e. All NSO / DNO • This session will always need to be tailored to the audience, to ensure well-focused and appropriate group discussions.
3.3	Coordinated assessments	4.29	The significant preparation work done by the facilitator to ensure the right context and right questions for group work paid off.	• Worked well, through good mix of principles, tips and targeted questions for group work, though could have still benefitted from local reps, such as ACAPS being in attendance.
3.5	Strategic Response Planning	4.21	<i>complex topic which should have had more time</i> Overall this session worked well and was timely for country review process next month.	•
3.4	Resource mobilisation	4.07	<i>information was v important as this is the most difficult task esp at county level;</i> It was difficult to include in-depth discussions on all 3 resources - money, people and supplies - in the time.	• Ideally this session needs to be presented by local representative, particularly for financial and supplies. • Human resource element could be developed further and look at links with the development actors in the country.
Overview of Day 3 (average 4.18) The day is pressured as all topics are complex and need to be well contextualised. However, the facilitators put in considerable time and effort in country to liaise with others to ensure an appropriate focus, and the high ratings show this paid off. The final session of the day focused on Action Planning which were to be emailed to the Nutrition Sector Coordinator.				
Rating of hotel		3.61 (see comments below under 'Venue')		
Overall rating of course		4.18		
2 session which contributed MOST to your development		Skills sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective meetings x 11 • Collaborative leadership & coordination skills x 9 • Niangoma simulation x 4 • Consensus & conflict management x 4 	Humanitarian topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource mobilisation x 7 • Strategic response planning x 5 • Inter-sector coordination x 5 • Information management x 4 • Developing partnerships x 3 • Roles and responsibilities x 2 • Coordinated needs assessments • Field realities • Humanitarian reform 	General Coordination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitation skills • Coordinating skills • Building networks
One thing to improve:		Time.... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an additional day to cover some of the topics to an in-depth level x 2 • allocate more time to exhaust concepts x 2 • allocate more time for discussions x 2 	Venue..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • venue was extremely cold • area of training was too cold especially for people from north frontier districts • next time hold workshop around Nairobi so can do some 	Style/ admin.... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase allowances • there was need for team building • OCHA is more confused than knowing what coordination is all

		<p>shopping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every room should have a TV set coz even communal one was not working x 2 • The hotel being faraway from town should at least provide people with TV in the room for both news update and entertainment. It should also have a shop for the basic things like toothpaste, shoe polish etc. 	<p>about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep participation and facilitation as active x 2
--	--	---	--

Well done! Loved Niangoma!

Everything was wonderful.

Thanks to UNICEF for supporting this training and to the trainers for driving the process.

The workshop is perfect the way it is, and the facilitators. Keep up the good work.

As a MOPHS person I would like to thank the organisers and the partners that funded this workshop. It was worth coming here all the way to go back with a lot of knowledge. God Bless you is what I can say. And to our facilitators - 'You Are the Best'

Facilitators were very good, and respected participants opinions. All answers were correct! This is very encouraging. Welcome again for other trainings in the future.

Training methodology was good as there was maximum involvement of the participants.

Gave me best practical tools and exposed strengths and weaknesses, especially when linked to effective meeting skills.

Most needed for operational areas.

Will improve efficiency and reduce time wasted.

This has come at an opportune time. It is now a matter of transferring theory into practice in the field.

OUTPUTS AND ACTIONS FROM GROUP WORK

Day 1: Current National and District forums

<i>National level</i>	<i>County level</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nutrition ICC 2. Nutrition technical forums with Four working groups (urban, capacity development, Nutrition response and advisory, information working) 3. KFSSG/ KFFSM 4. MIYCN 5. UNOCHA 6. WESCORD 7. Monitoring & Evaluation and Research steering committee 8. NMDCC (National Micronutrient deficiency control council) 9. Healthy diets and lifestyles 10. CHS ICC 11. Child health ICC 12. HNSF 13. PMTCT steering groups 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CNTF/DNTF 2. District steering Group (DSG) 3. Urban working groups 4. Child survival and development steering group (Nyanza and western) 5. BFHI committee 6. DFSSG 7. District Health stakeholders forum (DHSF) /HNSF (Refugees)

Challenges of the Forums

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor planning for meetings 2. Lack of funding 3. Ineffective leadership 4. Membership not defined 5. High staff turn over 6. Poor follow up of action points (leadership gaps/objectivity and accountability of action points) 7. Poor partner participation / Lack of quorums 8. Poor communication on attendance i.e. most of the time there is short notice on attendance, and invitation is not sent to all key stakeholders/partners 9. Lack/poor of commitment by the stakeholders 10. Lack of feedback on the meetings 11. Lack of consistency 12. Poor linkage both horizontal and vertical i.e. with other sectoral coordination forums 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. No clear TOR for the meetings 14. minutes not shared with stakeholders 15. Passive participation and Inability of members to make key decisions as a result of poor readership of members or poor delegation 16. Political and personal interests dominating the agenda/conflict of interest from stakeholders-Agenda not followed 17. Too many meetings as a result of creation of too many districts /divergent interests 18. Coordination limited to emergency districts 19. Logistical constrains for regular meetings complicated by demand for facilitation allowance 20. Suspicion and lack of transparency in pulling resources together as well as utilisation 21. Duplication of the agenda/partner efforts 22. More of routine than action oriented and sometimes more responsive than planned 23. Structures unclear/lack of understanding where does some of the meetings feed into
---	--

Impact of county level coordination

Positive	Negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced bureaucracy- all decisions will be made at the county level • Resource allocation at the county level which its hopped to enhance planning and coordination • Devolved funds might have the potential to inspire ownerships and self-drive for results by creating competition among counties • Reduced number of unnecessary meetings –consolidate smaller meetings • Enhanced partnership and commitment • Efficient planning and effectiveness on the use of resources /transparency • Clearer and better contextualising of TOR-better coordination • Possibility of solving leadership puzzles due to pulling together responsibilities at one level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devolution will empower the counties to make decision faster • Enhanced planning, communication and information management • Unclear definition of the role of the national level coordination support to the county • Heterogeneity in county characteristic might hamper consensus building and representation priorities • Vastness of the counties might affect active participation of partners • Conflict of interest/Political dynamics • Uncertainty. Will the challenges worsen or improve? Leadership poor/good? Who will lead?

How can we address NSO challenges (group 1)

Resources	NSOs are resources and there is need to define the resources Escalate feedback to national levels Share mapping and resources for integration	Planning	Resource mapping Use of data for advocacy
Leadership	Share TORs of NSOs Accountability from other actors Quarterly supervision to follow up on accountability and leadership issues	Communication	Clear communication channels MOH to take leadership

District level nutrition coordination: How can all sector members contribute better? (group 3 and 4)

- DMOH/DHMT to take leadership with technical guidance from the DNO
- DNO calls for the agenda and consolidates the final agenda/action points and specifying persons moving the agenda
- DNO to follow-up on the action points
- Proper planning: make sure that the dates are planned early and communicated, minutes and agenda are shared
- Mapping of the partners and capacities
- Clearly defined TORs by the DNO
- Define memberships
- Elevate DNTF to CNTF
- Establish intersector linkages
- Documentation and use of information for advocacy –through bulletin and utilising of the nutrition website

Responsibilities and process of devolution (groups 5 and 6)**Responsibilities***CNTF*

1. Validation of surveys
2. Mapping of partnerships
3. Human resource management
4. Advocacy and resource mobilisation
5. Increased decision space around resource allocation
6. Increased oversight on programs by county government
7. Improved accountability. partners county level government responsiveness of service

Partners

- Follow the government protocols
- Required to offer more support during and after transition

Changes

- The chair will reflect the new structure of coordination
- Most of the sub committees and steering groups will be devolved to the county government
- The vetting of implementing partners and performance will be the responsible of the county
- Harmonising and streamlining of assessment and surveys
- County lobbying, mobilising and advocating for its resources

Processes required for success

- Clear governance structures at county level and awareness created on the structures
- Competent officers to guide transition –leadership and management
- Clear standards and guidelines
- Capacity development
- Technical support from national level- from the national level-gaps and bottlenecks
- Information exchange-successful counties to support counties facing difficulties
- Need for a well-defined TOR for county coordination mechanisms
- Allocation for resources
- Sector wide approach to ensure success

Day 3 : Information Management**How to improve the Role of DNO/NSO in data quality assurance**

- Validation of information during facility visits
- Enhanced supervision mechanisms and highlight importance of OJT
- Strengthen capacity of health workers within the primary health facilities
- Maintain rigour of guidelines and standards / indicators
- Distribution of data collection tools
- Joint supervision teams for facility visits (DNO/DHRO/NSO)
- Supervision tools to be standardised and shared (checklists)
- Facility capacity for interpretation of data / reporting
- Audit of facility information and ensure feedback (two way crucial)
- Channel all data via DHIS
- Periodic DQA quarterly
- Building DHRO/DNO/NSO to assess quality of reporting
- Performance indicator review to be placed on agenda of DNTF
- Importance of feeding back success and acknowledge achievements
- Strategic and organised manner of communicating changes
- Clarify some issues with DHIS formula

How to elevate the efficient utilisation of DHIS data for planning and action

- Use DHIS for baseline and target setting for the annual work plan
- Data analysis elevated, especially by consulting facility staff to greater degree
- Greater use for advocacy
- Remember to reward and acknowledge good performance
- Capacity building of all users of the DHIS and not just End Users
- Accelerate feedback through invigorated DNTF
- Development of support and supervision mechanisms as a basis for mentorship

How to build on demonstrated successes

- Maintaining consistency on feedback
- Award systems
- Ensuring availability of reporting tools
- Sharing of best practices – **champion districts / experts and technical and operational focal points**

Day 3 : Coordinated Assessments**How can a greater strategic involvement of DNO/NSO in short and long rains assessment ensure heightened accuracy and advocacy at the national level?**

- These positions should be part of the whole process and be integrated into all steps where appropriate
- Appoint representatives from nutrition department at the county level

How can the DNO/NSO have greater involvement in the EWS?

- These positions to provide technical support to the sentinel sites
- Engagement with ARLMP data analysts
- Revision (National Data) analysis tools as well as software
- Segregate data for cross cutting issues to be assessed and responded to
- Active case finding and referral to IMAM sites

How can there be better timing from finalisation of survey results to response planning?

- Specific recommendations – who/what/how/when?
- Dissemination of preliminary report within 2 weeks to all levels
- Contextualise recommendations
- Disaggregation for planning and analysis
- Adherence to survey calendar

Nutrition coordination training workshop 22nd - 24th August 2012

Participant List

Province	Name	Organisation	Designation	COUNTY/location
Eastern Province	Christopher Kiamba	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Marsabit
	Emmy Maina	MOH	Provincial Nutrition officer	Moyale
	Jackline Kanini	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Mwingi
	Zaida Mohamed	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Isiolo
	Peninah Lwaya	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Kitui
	George Kuria	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Marsabit
	Olive Muthamia	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Moyale
	Emiliana Mbelenga	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Mwingi/Kitui/Makueni
	Josephine Muli	UNWFP	Head of subnational office	Isiolo
	Elizabeth Cherop	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Isiolo
North Eastern	Musa Idetie	MOH	Provincial Nutrition officer	Garrissa
	Abdi Malik	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Ijara
	Deka Mohamed	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Wajir
	Abdiqadir Billow Hussein	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Mandera
	Francis Kidake	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Daadab
	Alisia Bonnie Osiro	Kenya Red Cross Society	Nutrition officer	Daadab
	Mulki Shukri	Kenya Red Cross Society	Nutrition officer	Daadab
	Laura Kiige	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Garrissa
	Hariet Namale	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Wajir
	Hariet Namale	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Wajir
Mathews Otieno	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Wajir/Mandera	
Rift valley	Bosco Losusui	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Samburu
	Cynthia Lokidor	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Turkana
	Leah Chelobei	MOH	District Nutrition officer	West Pokot
	Ann Kimwa	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Baringo
	Jane Oluoch	MOH	District Nutrition officer	Narok
	Janet Ntwiga	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Kajiado
	Regina Karanja	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Laikipia
	Humphrey Mosomi	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Samburu

	Nicholas Kirimi	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Turkana
	Sharon Kirera	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	West Pokot
	Lilian Odhiambo	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Baringo
Coast	Rachel Kahindi	MOH	Provincial Nutrition officer	Tana River
	Bonface Muia	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Kilifi
	Anne Cherobon	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Tana River
Western/Nyanza	Susan Jobando	Unicef/ UNOPS	Nutrition Support officer	Western/Nyanza
National-Nairobi	Grace Gichohi	MOH	Division of nutrition-Emergency nutrition program officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	James Njiru	MOH	Division of nutrition-MIYCN nutrition program officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	John Mwai	MOH	National Micronutrient nutrition program officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Samuel Murage	MOH	Division of nutrition-M&E nutrition program officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Terry wefawwa	MOH	Head of Division of Nutrition	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Evelyne Matiri	USAID	Nutrition officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Olivia Agutu	UNICEF	Emergency nutrition officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Marjorie Volege	UNICEF	Emergency nutrition officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Kibet Chirchir	UNICEF	M&E officer	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Mathieu Joyeux	UNICEF	Nutrition specialist- Emergency	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Grainne Moloney	UNICEF	Chief of Nutrition- Unicef	Nairobi
National-Nairobi	Brenda Akwanyi	UNICEF/ DoN	Nutrition sector coordinator	Nairobi
	Linda Richardson	Nutrition works	Facilitators	GNC
	Paul Rees-Thomas	Nutrition works	Facilitators	GNC