A landscaping of global data visualization tools for nutrition
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Glossary of acronyms

- **ACT**: Artemisinin-based combination therapy
- **ALMA**: African Leaders Malaria Alliance
- **ATNI**: Access to Nutrition Index
- **BMS**: Breastmilk substitute
- **CSANN**: Civil Society Alliance for Nutrition in Nepal
- **DataDENT**: Data for Decisions to Expand Nutrition Transformation
- **DHS**: Demographic and Health Survey
- **DPT3**: Diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis
- **DVT**: Data visualization tool
- **FAO**: Food and Agriculture Organization
- **GFDx**: Global Fortification Exchange
- **GNR**: Global Nutrition Report
- **HANCI**: Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index
- **iCCM**: Integrated community case management of malaria
- **IFA**: Iron-folic acid
- **IRM**: Insecticide resistance management
- **LLIN**: Long-lasting insecticide net
- **MNCH**: Maternal, newborn and child health
- **MNCH&N**: Maternal, newborn and child health and nutrition
- **MOH**: Ministry of Health
- **MP**: Member of Parliament
- **MSP**: Multi-sectoral platform
- **N4G**: Nutrition for Growth
- **NCD RisC**: Non-Communicable Disease Risk Factor Collaboration
- **NiPN**: National Information Platforms for Nutrition
- **NTD**: Neglected Tropical Disease
- **PANITA**: Partnership for Nutrition in Tanzania
- **PHC**: Primary health care
- **PIM**: Planning, implementation, and monitoring
- **POSHAN**: Partnerships and Opportunities to Strengthen and Harmonize Actions for Nutrition in India
- **RDT**: Rapid diagnostic test
- **SDG**: Sustainable Development Goal
- **SOWC**: State of the World’s Children
- **SUN MEAL**: Scaling Up Nutrition Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
- **UN**: United Nations
- **UNICEF**: United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund
- **USAID**: United States Agency for International Development
- **WHA**: World Health Assembly
- **WHO**: World Health Organization
- **WHO NLiS**: World Health Organization Nutrition Landscape Information System
Key Findings & Recommendations
Summary of Key Findings from a review of existing Data Visualization tools for Nutrition to identify lessons and best practices (1/2)

There is a growing number (22) of Data Visualization tools (DVTs) in nutrition which may lead to mixed messages and confusion

- DVTs with a broad scope report many common indicators, sometimes using different definitions (e.g. IFA supplementation) that lead to different results, potentially making it challenging to identify which DVTs (and indicators) to use for decision-making and advocacy
- Some DVTs use different indicators or methodologies to report on similar topics, which can lead to different rankings (e.g. traffic light ranking) and send mixed messages to users
- Several overlapping DVT launches during the same time period could contribute to confusing messages and fatigue

Very few DVTs have clear and focused theories of change\(^1\) about the decision(s) they are trying to influence

- Most of the DVTs reviewed do not have explicitly clear theories of change in terms of the audience or decisions they are trying to influence
- The African Leaders Malaria Alliance (ALMA) scorecard is a gold star example. It has a clear and focused theory of change with defined objectives and audience, includes a large number actionable indicators, and has a clear engagement plan for its targeted audience

Notes:

1 A clear theory of change identifies a long-term goal and the pathway(s) needed to achieve that goal, specifically articulating that if the initiative were to perform X action, then Y will change for the following reasons, assuming the right preconditions were in place. In this case, a clear theory of change for a DVT would articulate a long-term goal and pathway for change that the DVT aims to achieve among a targeted group of stakeholders. (Adapted from USAID’s Learning Lab, “What is this thing called “Theory of Change?””)
Summary of Key Findings from a review of existing Data Visualization tools for Nutrition to identify lessons and best practices (2/2)

**DVTs could include more actionable indicators** to support decision-making
- Except for DVTs focused on raising awareness, DVTs could include more actionable indicators for decision-making
- Actionable indicators for nutrition can be broadly grouped into 3 domains: enabling environment, enacted legislations, and coverage
- Three strategies could be used to increase DVTs’ number of actionable indicators: 1) use actionable indicators currently reported elsewhere; 2) incorporate and use new actionable indicators; and 3) display actionable indicators for which there is no data to raise the priority of collecting this data

**There are different ways of visualizing data; the choice should be based on the DVT’s goals, as well as users’ decision needs and data literacy levels**
- Different ways of displaying data are more or less suitable to respond to particular decision needs and data literacy – e.g., bar charts to compare across interventions, maps to compare across geographies, color coding for intuitive assessment of status, interactive/static, etc.
- A follow-on analysis will be conducted to explore how DVTs are being used and which visualization formats resonate most with global (and where possible country) stakeholders for decision-making through a forthcoming series of stakeholder consultations

**Notes:**
1 Actionable indicators provide data that can be acted upon to improve performance and management at the program and systems levels.
Recommendations for the Global Community of DVT producers & funders

Recommendations for DVT producers

**Have a clear theory of change:**
- Which decisions (by which users) does the DVT aim to support?
- What supporting actions are needed to deliver the change?

**Include actionable indicators** that align with the DVT's theory of change (including indicators with little to no data for advocacy purposes)

**Test visualization formats with targeted users** to ensure formats align with users' data literacy levels and decision needs

Recommendations for Global Community of DVT producers & funders

**Support coordination** among the global DVT community to increase synergies, reduce inefficiencies, and share learnings

**Convene DVT producers that report on common indicators** to reduce differences in definitions and divergent messages

**Strengthen capacity** of targeted users to interpret and use data for decision-making
Overview and approach
Why visualize data and why are data visualization tools helpful?

1. Why visualize data?
   - Human brains more rapidly process visuals compared to text
   - Data are more persuasive as graphs compared to tables

2. What are data visualizations?
   Data visualizations are defined as outputs that help people understand the significance of data by placing it in a visual context (e.g., bar graphs, scatterplots, etc.)

3. Why are data visualization tools (DVTs) helpful?
   - DVTs are interfaces between data systems and data users, making them useful in facilitating decision-making, advocacy, and communication
   - Indicator choices and visuals in DVTs can ensure focus on key priorities and facilitate data interpretation to better support decisions
   - Different types of DVTs are usually associated with different types of goals, objectives, and decisions

Notes:
1 Source: Adapted from Evergreen, Stephanie DH. *Effective Data Visualization: The Right Chart for the Right Data*. SAGE Publications, 2016.
Different types of DVTs are usually associated with different types of goals, objectives, and decisions

DVTs very rarely fall only into one of these typologies – they often mix goals and features across the different typologies
Scope: landscaping existing DVTs in nutrition at the global level to capture best practices and lessons learned

Primary: The primary objective of the DVT landscaping is to review existing global DVTs in nutrition and examine how they contribute to the nutrition landscape as well as identify best practices and lessons learned on how DVTs are used globally and in countries.

Secondary: A secondary objective is to identify best practices and lessons learned on how data visualizations from other sectors (malaria and primary healthcare (PHC)) are used to support decision-making.

Objective

Scope of Work

Producers

- Across a list of 22 existing DVTs in nutrition at the global level, the team reviewed: (1) goals and theories of change; (2) domains and indicators; (3) output structure; and (4) dissemination processes.
- Consultations were held with a select number of DVT producers in nutrition and other sectors (malaria and PHC).

Users

- Review evaluations of existing DVTs, when available, to understand how DVTs are being used among their targeted users and their overall impact.
- Consultations with select users at the global level will be conducted to understand how existing DVTs support decision-making in nutrition and what gaps still currently exist.

While this analysis focuses exclusively at the global level, a landscaping of nutrition DVTs in India will be completed by IFPRI to complement this analysis to provide a case study with lessons and experiences at the country level.
A three step approach was used to identify and ultimately select 22 global DVTs from a pool of 33 global DVTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step I: Scope&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Step II: Identification</th>
<th>Step III: Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1**  
DVTs are outputs that help people understand the significance of data by placing it in a visual context (e.g., bar graphs, scatterplots, etc.). For this analysis, only open access platforms were included. | **3**  
An internet search was conducted to review major nutrition initiatives and a Google keyword search was conducted to identify nutrition DVTs | **5**  
Only publicly accessible DVTs were included. Therefore, paper-based DVTs only available offline or used internally by organizations were excluded. |
| **2**  
DVTs that display nutrition data were included—primarily those with a nutrition-specific focus. However, select DVTs focusing on Maternal, Newborn, Child Health, and Nutrition (MNCH&N) such as Countdown to 2030 were included since nutrition is viewed within the continuum of care. | **4**  
Partner recommendations of nutrition DVTs were also included in the review | **6**  
Only DVTs that are global products, covering multiple countries, were included. Therefore, country-specific DVTs managed by governments or other actors were excluded from this analysis<sup>2</sup> |
| **7**  
Only recently refreshed DVTs (within the past 5 years) were included<sup>3</sup> | | **7**  
Only recently refreshed DVTs (within the past 5 years) were included<sup>3</sup> |

**Notes:**
1 Please see Appendix slide 50 for the full list of global DVTs reviewed for this landscaping.
2 While this analysis did not review country-specific DVTs, IFPRI will be conducting a landscaping of DVTs in India to complement this global analysis with a country perspective.
3 Please note the World Bank Nutrition Country Profiles were included as part of this analysis (despite not having been updated since 2011) as it was the predecessor to other DVTs in nutrition.
Global DVTs in nutrition were reviewed in 2 processes: (1) a desk review focusing on 4 parameters; and (2) a series of stakeholder consultations

1 Desk review

- **Goals:** DVTs were grouped into two broad categories: (1) accountability; and (2) planning, implementation, and monitoring.
- **Audience:** Where possible, the targeted audience of DVTs was identified.

2 Stakeholder consultations

- **DVT producers**
  - 10 DVT producers were interviewed regarding:
    - Their DVT’s theory of change, outputs, dissemination processes, engagement strategies with users, and production/maintenance of the DVT.
    - Who uses their DVT, how people are using their DVT, and any feedback (positive/areas for development) they have received from users.

- **Existing users of DVTs**
  - Where possible, existing users of DVTs were interviewed regarding:
    - Organizational role and responsibilities.
    - How they use the DVT to support their decision-making needs for nutrition at work.
    - Strengths and challenges of the DVT in accessing and using data, as well as the DVT’s value add relative to other DVTs.
    - User’s experiences with data.

Notes:
1 Actionable indicators provide data that can be acted upon to improve performance and management at the program and systems levels.
2 See appendix slides 51-57 for further detail on methods.
Key Findings
Key finding #1

There is a growing number (22) of Data Visualization tools (DVTs) in nutrition which may lead to mixed messages and confusion

- DVTs with a broad scope report many common indicators, sometimes using different definitions (e.g. IFA supplementation) that lead to different results, potentially making it challenging to identify which DVTs (and indicators) to use for decision-making and advocacy
- Some DVTs use different indicators or methodologies to report on similar topics, which can lead to different rankings (e.g. traffic light ranking) and send mixed messages to users
- Several overlapping DVT launches during the same time period could contribute to confusing messages and fatigue
DVTs in nutrition aim to achieve two distinct goals with some nutrition DVTs trying to achieve both goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Goals</th>
<th>DVTs in nutrition (n= 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability: Aims to hold governments or other stakeholders accountable for delivering on a specific commitment or achieving global targets/goals (e.g., WHA targets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability DVTs tend to focus more on outcome indicators, and use color-coding/rankings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, implementation, and monitoring (PIM): Aims to provide data to support a range of stakeholders in planning, implementation, and monitoring progress across countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIM DVTs focus more on enabling environment, enacted legislation, coverage indicators and, in some cases, also include outcome indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 See appendix slide 54 for information on goal classification methodology.
DVTs can cover singular or multiple topics in nutrition...
...and also vary by (1) typology, (2) visualization formats, (3) production frequencies, and (4) number of indicators reported per DVT

**By typology**

- **10** Dashboards
- **6** Profiles
- **4** Scorecards
- **5** Indices

**By visualization**

- **13** Bar graphs
- **9** Maps
- **7** Tables

**By production frequency**

- **9** DVTs refreshed annually
- **2** DVTs refreshed in 2-3 years

- *14 DVTs have had launches since June 2017*

**By # total of indicators reported¹ per DVT**

- **1**
- **20**
- **35**
- **143**

Notes:

1 The total number of indicators included on this graph is based on all indicators reported within each DVT.
DVTs with a broad scope report many common indicators, sometimes using different definitions.

While DVTs report the same definitions for nutrition status indicators, indicators from other domains may have varying definitions, potentially making it challenging for users to identify which DVTs (and indicators) to use for decision-making – e.g., DVTs often report varying definitions for zinc supplementation for diarrhea and antenatal iron supplementation, leading to different results.

Notes:
1. This analysis includes nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive indicators. For nutrition-sensitive indicators, only indicators measuring interventions with clear evidence of impact on nutrition outcomes and intermediate outcomes were included. (Synthesis of Evidence of Multisectoral Approaches for Improved Nutrition, November 2017, Banking on Nutrition Partnership.)
2. Some indicators covering the same topic were grouped and counted as one indicator to facilitate comparison across DVTs; e.g., indicators for women's anemia (<11g/dL and <12g/dL Hgb) were grouped as one indicator.
3. Aspirational indicators are indicators for which indicator definitions may exist but there is no data. Specifically, SUN MEAL and Countdown have included indicators in the MEAL framework and Countdown tier 3 indicator list, respectively, but are not shown in the visualizations due to lack of data, and as such, those indicators were not included in the analysis conducted to create this slide.
4. While DVTs do have a large number of indicators, they often do go through thoughtful indicator selection processes. Please see examples of SUN MEAL and Countdown 2030’s indicator selection processes in the Appendix (slide 58).
Some DVTs use different methodologies that lead to different traffic light rankings in similar areas, potentially sending mixed messages to users.

**KEY FINDING #1**

**Inclusion and quality of WHA targets in national policies, as well as progress towards meeting WHA targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Inclusion of WHA targets in nutrition plans</th>
<th>Inclusion and quality of WHA targets in national policies, as well as progress towards meeting WHA targets</th>
<th>Political commitment for hunger reduction and addressing undernutrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>3-4 targets = Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>3-4 targets = Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3-4 targets = Good</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very low commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3-4 targets = Good</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very low commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Please note that the colors displayed for each of the ratings have been directly pulled from the DVTs reviewed for this slide. No adaptation has been made to these ratings.
2. For the SUN MEAL dashboard, only the indicator that tracks the number of WHA targets in national nutrition plans was pulled for this review.
3. Please see appendix slide 59-60 for more information on DVT methodologies for constructing color coding / rankings.
Several overlapping DVT launches targeting similar audiences in a 12-month period potentially contributes to confusing messages and fatigue.
Key finding #2

Very few DVTs have clear and focused theories of change about the decision(s) they are trying to influence

- Most of the DVTs reviewed do not have explicitly clear theories of change in terms of the audience or decisions they are trying to influence
- The African Leaders Malaria Alliance (ALMA) scorecard is a gold star example. It has a clear and focused theory of change with defined objectives and audience, includes a large number actionable indicators, and has a clear engagement plan for its targeted audience

Notes:
1 A clear theory of change identifies a long-term goal and the pathway(s) needed to achieve that goal, specifically articulating that if the initiative were to perform X action, then Y will change for the following reasons, assuming the right preconditions were in place. In this case, a clear theory of change for a DVT would articulate a long-term goal and pathway for change that the DVT aims to achieve among a targeted group of stakeholders. (Adapted from USAID’s Learning Lab, “What is this thing called “Theory of Change?””)
DVTs track many domains related to different audiences: policies, financing, healthy diets, coverage, & progress toward global goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Nutrition Policies</td>
<td>Four DVTs – HANC, Measuring Progress Towards Ending Malnutrition, the Global Breastfeeding Scorecard, and the Global Scorecard of Iodine Nutrition – aim to hold governments (sometimes via civil society) accountable for improved nutrition policies (i.e., strong political commitment to nutrition, incorporating WHA targets in their national plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors and governments</td>
<td>Financing for Nutrition</td>
<td>Seven DVTs – HANC, N4G Accountability Tool, Investing in Nutrition, SUN MEAL, Countdown to 2030, the World Bank Nutrition Country Profiles, and the GNR Country Profiles – aim to hold donors and governments accountable for nutrition financing by ensuring disbursements for nutrition are tracked for commitments or by advocating for additional funding for nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Healthy Diets</td>
<td>One DVT – the Access to Nutrition Index (ATNI) – aims to improve consumer access to healthy foods and improve diets by ranking the world’s largest manufacturers on their nutrition-related commitments, practices, and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and development partners</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Nine DVTs – the Global Fortification Data Exchange, Global Breastfeeding Scorecard, Vitamin A Supplementation dashboard, SUN MEAL, Countdown 2030, National Anemia profiles, WHO NLiS profiles, State of the World’s Children, and State of Acute Malnutrition – aim to support government and development partners in planning, implementing, and monitoring activities by providing information on key nutrition interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress Towards Global Goals</td>
<td>Eight DVTs – WHO Global Targets Tracking Tool, SUN MEAL, Countdown 2030, GNR profiles, Measuring Progress Towards Ending Malnutrition, the Global Food Security Index, the Joint Child Malnutrition Estimates Dashboard and the Global Hunger Index – aim to hold countries and development partners accountable for achieving global goals, including WHA targets, SDGs, etc., by publicly tracking progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FINDING #2
Clearly defined theories of change are critical to influence decision-making and drive change.

Many DVTs reviewed seem to have implicitly broad theories of change, meaning they often do not specify:
- A targeted audience or stakeholders
- A set of explicit decisions and/or behavior they are trying to influence
- A clear pathway of how available data and supporting actions leads to the desired change

The African Leaders Malaria Alliance (ALMA) scorecard is often lauded as a successful DVT because it includes:
- A focused theory of change with a very targeted set of decision-makers (i.e., African Heads of States) it is supporting
- Actionable indicators that align with their agenda: Actionable indicators are coded with action loops (i.e., color coding and upward/downward arrows) and recommended actions are provided to facilitate action needed by Heads of States
- A strong engagement strategy with their targeted decision-makers: Heads of States are provided with quarterly reports on progress and meet regularly as part of ALMA. When requested, ALMA also facilitates connections to provide technical assistance to countries

Notes:
1 A clear theory of change identifies a long-term goal and the pathway(s) needed to achieve that goal, specifically articulating that if the initiative were to perform X action, then Y will change for the following reasons, assuming the right preconditions were in place. In this case, a clear theory of change for a DVT would articulate a long-term goal and pathway for change that the DVT aims to achieve among a targeted group of stakeholders. (Adapted from USAID’s Learning Lab, "What is this thing called “Theory of Change?”")
Key finding #3

DVTs could include more actionable indicators¹ to support decision-making

- Except for DVTs focused on raising awareness, DVTs could include more actionable indicators for decision-making
- Actionable indicators for nutrition can be broadly grouped into 3 domains: enabling environment, enacted legislations, and coverage
- Three strategies could be used to increase DVTs’ number of actionable indicators: 1) use actionable indicators currently reported elsewhere; 2) incorporate and use new actionable indicators; and 3) display actionable indicators for which there is no data to raise the priority of collecting this data

Notes:
1 Actionable indicators provide data that can be acted upon to improve performance and management at the program and systems levels.
**Actionable indicators** provide data that can be acted upon to improve performance and management at the program and systems levels.

**KEY FINDING #3**

Actionable indicators – imperative for decision-making – can be broadly grouped into 3 different domains in nutrition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Sub-domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enabling environment            | ▪ Existence, implementation, and quality of relevant institutions, platforms and coordinating mechanisms  
                                        ▪ Existence, implementation, and quality of nutrition policies/plans  
                                        ▪ Availability and capacity of nutrition and relevant professionals  
                                        ▪ Availability of appropriate budget for nutrition and actual spending/expenditures in nutrition  
                                        ▪ Active engagement of the private sector |
| Enacted legislations            | Existence, implementation, and monitoring of:  
                                        ▪ BMS Code legislation  
                                        ▪ Maternity Protection legislation  
                                        ▪ Food fortification legislations |
| Coverage                        | ▪ Maternal intervention coverage  
                                        ▪ Infant/child intervention coverage  
                                        ▪ Household intervention coverage  
                                        ▪ Food fortification coverage |
Across DVTs (accountability, PIM, or both), DVTs could still include more actionable indicators\(^1\) to support decision-making.

### Average # of actionable indicators per DVT by goal and domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>PIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Environment for Nutrition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted Legislations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage (includes maternal, infant/child, and other)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Most commonly reported actionable indicators:

- Government spending on education, health and social protection
- Government spending on agriculture
- BMS Code legislation
- Maternity protection legislation
- Wheat flour fortification legislation
- IFA supplementation during pregnancy
- Antenatal care visits during pregnancy
- Vitamin A supplementation
- Zinc and/or ORS treatment for diarrhea

### Enabling environment and enacted legislation actionable indicators could also focus on implementation and monitoring of policies and systems

- Average # of actionable indicators per DVT by goal and domain:
  - 4-6 actionable indicators
  - 2-3 actionable indicators
  - 0-1 actionable indicators

### Notes:

1. This analysis includes nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive indicators. For nutrition-sensitive indicators, only indicators measuring interventions with clear evidence of impact on nutrition outcomes and intermediate outcomes were included. (Synthesis of Evidence of Multisectoral Approaches for Improved Nutrition, November 2017, Banking on Nutrition Partnership.)

2. Some indicators covering the same topic were grouped and counted as one indicator to facilitate comparison across DVTs; e.g., separate indicators covering the presence of NCD targets in national plans (i.e. overweight/obesity in adults, diabetes, salt intake) were grouped as one indicator.

3. DVTs typically only report indicators for which there is data available; aspirational indicators are only very rarely listed and/or reported, therefore aspirational indicators from SUN MEAL and Countdown 2030 (indicators that both DVTs would like to track but are not displayed on their dashboards due to lack of data) were not included for this analysis.
DVTs could potentially employ three strategies for increasing their focus on actionable indicators

DVTs that currently include few actionable indicators could consider the following strategies – if the inclusion of those actionable indicators aligns with their theory of change:

1. Use currently reported actionable indicators
   Use and/or adapt currently reported actionable indicators

2. Incorporate and use new actionable indicators
   Incorporate and use new actionable indicators using population-based surveys or other methods (such as annual assessments and policy reviews) to include in DVTs

3. Display actionable indicators with no data
   Where actionable indicators cannot be populated due to lack of existing data, consider displaying the indicator on the DVT to raise the priority for collecting the data

Notes:
1 Please see the Appendix (slides 61-67) for full list of actionable indicators included in existing DVTs.
Integrating more actionable indicators in DVTs can facilitate decision-making—below are examples of indicators that could be included

- = indicator not used in DVTs, but could potentially be collected or calculated
  - = indicator used in select DVTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Why it is important</th>
<th>Examples of actionable indicators that could be included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enabling environment: multisectoral governance | A high-level platform with focal points from each sector and working groups is considered as key for an effective and sustainable multisectoral nutrition system | ▪ Existence and composition of Multi-Stakeholder Platforms (MSP) (yes/no)<sup>3</sup>  
▪ Nutrition governance score ("strong", "medium" or "weak")<sup>3</sup>  
▪ Annual meeting frequency of multisectoral coordination body (“frequently, sometimes, rarely”) |
| Enacted Legislation: BMS code      | Global stakeholders need data on BMS code legislation and compliance, as aggressive marketing of BMS can discourage breastfeeding<sup>4</sup> | ▪ BMS code legislation adopted (yes/no)<sup>5</sup>  
▪ Women’s exposure to BMS promotion (%) |
| Coverage: maternal                 | The updated 2016 WHO guidelines on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience highlight the importance of nutrition-specific interventions<sup>6</sup> | ▪ Iron folic acid supplementation during pregnancy (%)<sup>5</sup>  
▪ Attendance of antenatal care visits (at least 1-4 visits) (%)<sup>5</sup>  
▪ Nutrition counseling during pregnancy (%)<sup>7</sup>  
▪ Monitoring weight gain during pregnancy (%)<sup>7</sup> |

While more improvement is needed for global actionable indicators, it is also worth considering: (a) when actionable indicators might need to be contextual and country-specific; and (b) when to include these indicators in DVTs based on the goal and ambitions of the DVT

Notes:
1 Please see Appendix slides 61-67 for a full list of actionable indicators currently available in DVTs.
2 Source: Supporting Multisectoral Action: Capacity and Nutrition Leadership Challenges Facing Africa, Jerling et al 2015, ReSAKSS.
3 MSP existence and composition is reported in SUN MEAL, while nutrition governance score is reported in the WHO NLIS (but please note that this indicator has not been updated since 2009).
5 Please note this indicator is commonly reported across several DVTs.
7 These indicators are collected by some surveys like the Performance Monitoring and Accountability (PMA) 2020 and the National Family Health Survey (NFHS) in India so are only available for select countries, but are not widely reported on DVTs.
There are different ways of visualizing data; the choice should be based on the DVT’s goals, as well as users’ decision needs and data literacy levels

- Different ways of displaying data are more or less suitable to respond to particular decision needs and data literacy – e.g., bar charts to compare across interventions, maps to compare across geographies, color coding for intuitive assessment of status, interactive/static, etc.
- A follow-on analysis will be conducted to explore how DVTs are being used and which visualization formats resonate most with global (and where possible country) stakeholders for decision-making through a forthcoming series of stakeholder consultations.
KEY FINDING #4

Different ways of displaying data vary in their ability to respond to decision needs and data literacy levels – vitamin A supplementation in Nigeria shows this.

Table formats present the statistic only

- 3 DVTs present Vitamin A statistics in table format, using data from 2014-16
- SUN MEAL uses an indexed color coded score to show that Vitamin A supplementation coverage is “poor” in Nigeria
- WHO NLiS country profiles is the only DVT using a table to separate dose 1 and 2

Map formats display statistics that allow for country comparison

- Coverage statistics are color coded by performance, indicating that Nigeria has 80% or greater coverage in 2016

Bar graphs\(^1\) allow for comparisons against other indicators

- 2 DVTs present Vitamin A supplementation coverage in bar graphs, using data from 2015
- Countdown presents Vitamin A supplementation coverage as part of the continuum of care
- State of the World’s Children report dashboard compares country and regional (red line) coverage statistics\(^2\)

Notes:
1. Bar graphs are also commonly used to show trend data, however there were no examples for this indicator – vitamin A supplementation – in Nigeria.
2. Similar to UNICEF’s State of the World’s Children report dashboard, the SUN MEAL country dashboards also include the median coverage for all SUN countries to facilitate the comparison between country and SUN Movement coverage statistics.
More complex and dynamic visual formats are also used – but are generally better suited for highly technical audiences.

The NCD RisC DVT visualizes the global burden of diabetes and shifting trends over time (1/2)

- A **sunburst plot** shows the prevalence of a given indicator across the population
- Here it shows the prevalence of diabetes in women by region

The NCD RisC DVT visualizes the global burden of diabetes and shifting trends over time (2/2)

- A **ranking plot** can display trend and prevalence data
- Here it shows the prevalence of diabetes by country and year

The GBD Compare tool’s interactive features allow for exploration of risk factors and causes of diseases

- A **treemap** visualizes the prevalence of an indicator and can be color coded to show different data subsets, such as gender
- Here risks are sized by their attribution to disability-adjusted life years (DALYs)

The No Wasted Lives State of Acute Malnutrition includes a map of current research on acute malnutrition

- An **interactive diagram** provides information on current ongoing acute malnutrition research, allowing users to connect studies in the visualization by different elements (e.g. location)
- Here it shows studies connected by topic area

Notes: 1 Please note that the Non-Communicable Disease Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD RisC) DVT and Global Burden of Disease (GBD) Compare tools were not included in this review of nutrition DVTs.
Nutrition case studies
CASE STUDY

The SUN MEAL system facilitates monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning across the SUN Movement while also supporting country needs.

The country dashboards are based off of SUN MEAL’s theory of change, aiming to improve nutrition to achieve the SDGs:

1. Multiple stakeholders from different sectors come together
2. Multiple stakeholders from different sectors change their behaviors
3. Multiple stakeholders mobilize resources and align implementation
4. Results are achieved through aligned implementation
5. Populations thrive, leading to the end of malnutrition by 2030 (SDG 2.2)
6. Better nutrition contributes to the achievement of SDGs

SUN MEAL intends to measure the results that SUN aims to achieve in SUN countries, grouping 79 indicators in 8 domains:

- Enabling environment for nutrition
- Drivers of nutrition
- Finance for nutrition
- IYCF Practices and dietary intakes
- Interventions and food supply
- Nutrition Status
- Enacted Legislations
- SDGs linked to better nutrition

The SUN MEAL system was created to facilitate monitoring, evaluation, and accountability across the SUN movement and support country-specific needs through these two products: the All SUN Countries Dashboard and the Country Dashboards.

In the All SUN Countries Dashboard, indicators are given a color-coded score (corresponding with critical, poor, moderate, or good performance) based on performance relative to other SUN countries except when established cut offs are available.

In the Country Dashboards, the color-coded score, exact statistic, year of data source, and median score of all SUN countries are displayed.

The SUN MEAL was first launched at the SUN Global Gathering in Abidjan in 2017 to assess progress across countries and identify themes and countries where progress is slower paced in order to better respond to countries’ demands.
HANCI country scorecards have a clear theory of change with a select set of indicators to support and influence governments...  

HANCI’s theory of change asserts that by measuring commitment, governments will be held more accountable...

HANCI’s domains are narrowly focused on the public spending, policies, and laws that reflect country commitment:

1. To assess country commitment towards ending hunger and malnutrition, HANCI focuses on two domains: hunger and nutrition.
2. Within these two domains, there are three themes: (1) public spending, (2) policies, and (3) laws, totaling only 22 indicators.
3. To compare with other countries, an indexed score is created by weighting each of these domains equally and the country is ranked.

HANCI country scorecards’ output design, shown for Ethiopia below, allows countries to quickly view areas of high political commitment and gaps, and compare their performance to others through an indexed score:

The public spending domain assesses government spending on hunger/malnutrition related sectors.

The policies domain includes government programs and policies on accessing services and interventions.

The laws domain includes legal frameworks and legislation on citizen rights related to food production and access to care.

Ethiopia’s performance in each indicator is ranked against the other 45 countries in the HANCI Africa Index to compare country performance.

Color-coding allows countries to identify areas with strong, moderate, and poor commitment. Cut-offs vary by indicator.
...and country advocates have noted their success in using HANCI to get nutrition on national political agendas

HANCI was first launched in 2012 globally and has since expanded its reach regionally and in countries...

- Since its launch, HANCI Global is published every 2-3 years; HANCI Africa was also launched in 2016 to focus only on African countries
- While HANCI Global and Africa focus globally and regionally, HANCI works closely with partner organizations in 5 countries – Bangladesh, Malawi, Nepal, Tanzania, and Zambia – to analyze the political will of their governments in reducing hunger and undernutrition

...leading to HANCI’s impact being seen in countries – select anecdotes included below...

**South Africa**

**Subnational Scorecard**
- While South Africa is ranked #1 in the Africa HANCI, a **subnational scorecard is being created** to unpack disparities at the regional level
- The sub-national scorecard will focus on **stunting** using similar methods as HANCI
- The scorecard is meant to be an advocacy and action tool that is engaging with stakeholders implementing on the ground (other countries are also considering building a subnational scorecard)

**Tanzania**

**Nutrition commitments in political manifestos**
- HANCI trained advocacy group Partnership for Nutrition in Tanzania (PANITA) on how to use and interpret the HANCI DVT, including how to identify advocacy messages
- PANITA presented HANCI data to parliamentarians, resulting in the inclusion of **nutrition commitments in political manifestos**
- A subnational scorecard was piloted for several districts, and HANCI engaged with the government on their own efforts in this area

**Nepal**

**Nutrition discussions in the Constitutional Assembly**
- HANCI trained the Civil Society Alliance for Nutrition in Nepal (CSANN) to include political commitment/will into their Advocacy and Communications Strategy
- CSANN and HANCI presented HANCI evidence to government representatives and bilateral donors, resulting in **nutrition included as a matter of public importance during Constitutional Assembly debates**
The GNR tracks a range of nutrition-related indicators with the goal of strengthening accountability...

**GNR’s overall goal** is to drive greater action to end malnutrition in all its forms with the following objectives:

- Remain a highly credible and well respected resource that is a ‘go-to’ platform for data and evidence on nutrition for both nutrition and non-nutrition actors
- Be an accessible and useful intervention which inspires action that accelerates progress toward a world free from malnutrition
- Inform and shape the debate and discussions on how to tackle malnutrition and contributes to the evidence base

**GNR’s domains and data** are broadly focused on nutrition-related metrics, mostly derived from external data sources:

1. The GNR focuses on economics, financial allocations, underlying determinants, enabling environment, coverage, diet, nutrition status, and global nutrition progress
2. The data displayed on the country profiles are derived from outside data sources including DHS, WHO, World Bank, and the UN
3. Progress Against Global Nutrition Targets is a unique score that measures country progress towards specific global metrics

The 2017 GNR country profile’s output design allows country-level stakeholders such as governments, policymakers, civil society, donors, and other influential groups to gain a high-level overview of the nutrition landscape within specific countries.

*Progress Against Global Nutrition Targets* are produced by GNR to hold governments more accountable in reaching global targets for nutrition (see slides 27-28 for methodology notes).

The GNR also visualizes data in its report (in addition to its country profiles) and is looking to update the GNR country profiles to include interactive features.
...and there are notable anecdotes highlighting the GNR’s credibility as a trusted data resource and key source for informing advocacy

GNR was first launched in 2014 globally and included country profiles for all 193 UN countries

The latest GNR report was launched in November 2018 in Bangkok at the Accelerating the End of Hunger and Malnutrition event, where updated and expanded country and regional profiles were released

The GNR is known as a highly credible data source for measuring global nutrition status and progress

- An online survey conducted by Johns Hopkins University found that among stakeholders who accessed aggregated data sources, the most accessed data source was the Global Nutrition Report (by 75% of stakeholders who accessed aggregated data sources)
- Key insights from GNR users – referenced from a consultation conducted by the GNR – highlights the GNR’s status as a critical data source in nutrition

The GNR website draws from a number of global audiences

- The majority of users in 2017 were from India, Bangladesh and the United States
- Other top locations also include Pakistan, United Kingdom, Mexico, and Kenya

Country-Level Information
Making clear comparisons for nutrition data between countries

“All of the specific country stuff is really great to have, as opposed to just global numbers, to get a better sense of where the issues lie”

Seeking Data
Searching for raw or visualized data on the GNR Website

“The GNR is a compendium of knowledge and information around current nutrition”

Informing Advocacy
Utilizing a credible source for advocacy purposes

“If I need something to bolster a report or if we’re taking MPs to show them some nutrition programmes in a developing country, then the GNR normally is one of the first go-to for that”

Notes:
1 This analysis was conducted on the 2017 GNR website and country profiles. As noted above, the GNR website has since relaunched its website and profiles in Nov 2018.
2 Source: GNR user insights PowerPoint.
Each NIPN National Institution has received a customized Excel template, including its country map with sub-national divisions. NIPN countries include: Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Laos, Niger, Uganda, and Zambia.

Notes:
1 To inform the development of their DVT, NIPN reviewed existing dashboards including: SUN MEAL, POSHAN district dashboards, GNR profiles, Countdown to 2030, and WHO NLiS country profiles.
Case studies in malaria and primary healthcare
ALMA was designed to meet requests of African Heads of State, providing actionable indicators for monitoring and accountability.

ALMA’s theory of change asserts that data tracking and support will help generate demand and action.

Malaria is eliminated by 2030

African Heads of State and Government consistently prioritize action to reduce malaria-related deaths

Demand generation

The quality of data tracked by ALMA is enhanced

Data tracking
1. ALMA scorecard and tracer MNCH metrics are updated
2. Best practices are documented

Heads of State and Government are supported to monitor their countries’ performance and take action

Advocacy
Quarterly reports for countries, annual ALMA awards, ALMA alerts, disseminate best practices, host meetings, disseminate outcomes of meetings; country level scorecards replicating the ALMA regional scorecard approach

Demand-driven response

Requests of Heads of State and Government are proactively addressed

Facilitated support
1. Collect requests from Heads of State, ministers, and MOH staff
2. Identify partners to provide support
3. Follow-up with partners as required

Catalytic support
Respond to requests made by Heads of State, facilitate country scorecards, advocate for MNCH scorecards at key meetings, mobilize resources, address bottlenecks

ALMA knowledge and expertise leveraged to provide catalytic support in MNCH and other areas

Notes:
1 Source: This Theory of Change is adapted from the ALMA Theory of Change and Scorecard Evaluation, ALMA-CIFF Grant, Final Report, 25 January 2013.
The majority of ALMA’s indicators are actionable, providing users with knowledge of what they can influence.

The scorecard includes indicators from 6 key domains – with majority of the indicators being actionable – to help drive decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALMA Domains</th>
<th>ALMA Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commodities financed</td>
<td>▪ LLIN IRS financing 2018 projection (% of need)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Public sector RDT financing 2018 projection (% of need)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Public sector ACT financing 2018 projection (% of need)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial control</td>
<td>▪ World Bank rating on public sector management and institutions 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Management</td>
<td>▪ Insecticide classes with mosquito resistance confirmed since 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Insecticide Resistance Monitoring and Management (Monitoring since 2015; National IRM Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ National Insecticide Resistance Monitoring and Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>▪ Scale of Implementation of iCCM (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Operational LLIN/IRS coverage (% of at risk population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>▪ Change in Estimated Malaria Incidence (2010-2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Change in Estimated Malaria Mortality (2010-2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracer indicators for maternal and child health</td>
<td>▪ Mass Treatment Coverage for Neglected Tropical Disease (NTD Index %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Estimated % of Total Population living with HIV who have access to antiretroviral therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Estimated % of children (0-14 years old) living with HIV who have access to antiretroviral therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ % deliveries by skilled birth attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Postnatal care (within 48 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Exclusive breastfeeding (% children &lt; 6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Vitamin A Coverage (2 doses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ DPT3 coverage (vaccination among 0-11 month olds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ALMA scorecard is unique as it combines elements of a scorecard and dashboard – supporting both accountability and decision-making

### Key features of ALMA’s structure and design enable it to drive action among Heads of States and countries...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Key Features of ALMA</th>
<th>Relevant Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actionable indicators</strong> across domains such as monitoring, commodities financed, and implementation enable decision-makers to address problem areas</td>
<td><strong>Financing commodities</strong>: When Heads of States have a “red” on financing, they have filled resource gaps quickly by reaching out to donors or using domestic funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Color-coding and trend arrows (up/down)**¹ were requested by Heads of States – and allows them to quickly see problem areas <em>(SMS alerts are also sent to notify senior ministry staff of changes in performance)</em></td>
<td><strong>Action loop and recommended actions</strong>: When countries have red indicators or indicators with downward arrows, a recommended action (or “action loop”) is triggered among Heads of States. ALMA also facilitates connections to partners to provide technical assistance as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequent data updates and data availability</strong> is needed for ALMA to be regularly used for decision-making. ALMA refreshes its scorecard once every quarter (even if there are data gaps to advocate for improved data)</td>
<td><strong>Better data collection</strong>: Previously, UNICEF data on integrated community case management (iCCM) was updated every 3 years, but now it is updated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first ALMA scorecard was launched in 2011 as an accountability tool for African Heads of States

**Notes:**
1 ALMA works with data owners to set data thresholds to avoid confusion on cut off values for color-coded performance.
The primary healthcare performance initiative (PHCPI) adapted their global DVT for country-level use

**PHCPI developed Vital Signs Profiles for country stakeholders to monitor primary healthcare**

- The Vital Signs Profiles give a snapshot on country performance in primary healthcare, allowing policymakers, development partners, and advocates to compare areas of the primary healthcare system and pinpoint areas for improvement.

**PHCPI’s theory of change\(^1\) covers the primary healthcare system, but emphasizes healthcare service delivery**

- PHCPI initiatives focus on the “black box” of service delivery performance because many countries already have data on inputs, outputs, and outcomes, but service delivery lacks data and requires further understanding.

- The Vital Signs Profiles cover four pillars, including financing, capacity, performance, and equity.

Notes:
1 PHCPI refers to this theory of change as their “conceptual framework”.
Vital Signs Profiles give a snapshot of country performance in primary healthcare service delivery to pinpoint priorities for improvement

The Vital Signs Profiles provide countries with a snapshot of the PHC system and identifies priorities for improvement in an easy-to-read format for a range of stakeholders – it is innovative because it is the first tool to capture how a PHC system is functioning overall.

On the website, users are able to see **breakdowns of composite scores** which are created from the indicators in the system, inputs, and service delivery indicators from the conceptual framework.

The country context at-a-glance, financing, and equity sections are populated with data from global repositories, and are validated by countries.

Access and quality indicators are populated by countries’ preferred sources, and where relevant, national country proxies.

The country scorecards were launched at the October 2018 ALMA ATA Anniversary and scorecards were disseminated in select countries.
Looking ahead
Recommendations for the Global Community of DVT producers & funders

Recommendations for DVT producers

Have a clear theory of change:
- Which decisions (by which users) does the DVT aim to support?
- What supporting actions are needed to deliver the change?

Include actionable indicators that align with the DVT's theory of change (including indicators with little to no data for advocacy purposes)

Test visualization formats with targeted users to ensure formats align with users' data literacy levels and decision needs

Recommendations for Global Community of DVT producers & funders

Support coordination among global DVT community to increase synergies, reduce inefficiencies, and share learnings

Convene DVT producers that report on common indicators to reduce differences in definitions and divergent messages

Strengthen capacity of targeted users to interpret and use data for decision-making
Considerations for future research

How do users use DVTs to support decision-making? What user needs are not currently addressed by existing DVTs? For which purposes are DVTs better suited to support decision-making?

Which indicators lead to action by different user groups? Which actionable indicators are missing to support action?

Which data visualization formats are most effective for which type of decision and decision-maker? How does this vary based on the context (user, experience with DVT, and/or culture of data use)?
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List of global nutrition DVTs reviewed

1. Access to Nutrition Index (ATNI)
2. ACF Measuring Progress Towards Ending Malnutrition
3. ACTION Nutrition for Growth Accountability Tool
4. Countdown to 2030 Country Dashboards
5. FAO Country Indicators
6. Global Food security index
7. Global Fortification Data Exchange (GFDx)
8. Global Hunger Index
10. Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index (HANCI) country scorecards
11. IGN Global Scorecard of Iodine Nutrition
12. No Wasted Lives State of Acute Malnutrition
13. R4D World Bank Invest in Nutrition
14. Scaling Up Nutrition Monitoring Evaluation Accountability and Learning (SUN MEAL) country dashboards
15. SPRING National Anemia Profiles
17. UNICEF/WHO Global Breastfeeding Scorecard
18. Vitamin A Supplementation Dashboard
19. WHO Global Targets Tracking Tool
20. WHO Nutrition Landscape Information System (NLiS) Country Profiles
22. World Bank Nutrition Country Profiles

Notes:
1 This analysis was conducted using only the 2017 GNR website and country profiles. The GNR website has since relaunched its website and profiles in Nov 2018.
Landscaping existing DVTs in nutrition at the global level to capture best practices and lessons learned

**Objective**

**Primary:** The primary objective of the DVT landscaping is to review existing global DVTs in nutrition and examine how they contribute to the nutrition landscape as well as identify best practices and lessons learned on how DVTs are used globally and in countries.

**Secondary:** A secondary objective is to identify best practices and lessons learned on how data visualizations from other sectors (malaria and primary healthcare (PHC)) are used to support decision-making.

### Scope of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Producers</th>
<th>Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Across a list of <strong>22 existing DVTs in nutrition at the global level</strong>, the team reviewed: (1) goals and theories of change; (2) domains and indicators; (3) output structure; and (4) dissemination processes</td>
<td>- Review evaluations of existing DVTs, when available, to understand how DVTs are being used among their targeted users and their overall impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consultations were held with a select number of DVT producers in nutrition and other sectors (malaria and PHC)</td>
<td>- Consultations with select users at the global level will be conducted to understand how existing DVTs support decision-making in nutrition and what gaps still currently exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this analysis focuses exclusively at the global level, a landscaping of nutrition DVTs in India will be completed by IFPRI to complement this analysis to provide a case study with lessons and experiences at the country level.
A three step approach was used to identify and ultimately select 22 global DVTs from a pool of 33 global DVTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step I: Scope</th>
<th>Step II: Identification</th>
<th>Step III: Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> DVTs are outputs that help people understand the significance of data by placing it in a visual context (e.g., bar graphs, scatterplots, etc.). For this analysis, only open access platforms were included.</td>
<td><strong>3</strong> An internet search was conducted to review major nutrition initiatives and a Google keyword search was conducted to identify nutrition DVTs</td>
<td><strong>5</strong> Only publicly accessible DVTs were included. Therefore, paper-based DVTs only available offline or used internally by organizations were excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> DVTs that display nutrition data were included —primarily those with a nutrition-specific focus. However, select DVTs focusing on Maternal, Newborn, Child Health, and Nutrition (MNCH&amp;N) such as Countdown to 2030 were included since nutrition is viewed within the continuum of care.</td>
<td><strong>4</strong> Partner recommendations of nutrition DVTs were also included in the review</td>
<td><strong>6</strong> Only DVTs that are global products, covering multiple countries, were included. Therefore, country-specific DVTs managed by governments or other actors were excluded from this analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Only recently refreshed DVTs (within the past 5 years) were included.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8</strong> Only recently refreshed DVTs (within the past 5 years) were included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1 Please see Appendix slide 50 for the full list of global DVTs reviewed for this landscaping.
2 While this analysis did not review country-specific DVTs, IFPRI will be conducting a landscaping of DVTs in India to complement this global analysis with a country perspective.
3 Please note the World Bank Nutrition Country Profiles were included as part of this analysis (despite not having been updated since 2011) as it was the predecessor to other DVTs in nutrition.
Global DVTs in nutrition were reviewed in 2 processes: (1) a desk review focusing on 4 parameters; and (2) a series of stakeholder consultations.

1 **Desk review**

**Goal & Audience**
- **Goals**: DVTs were grouped into two broad categories: (1) accountability; and (2) planning, implementation, and monitoring
- **Audience**: Where possible, the targeted audience of DVTs was identified

**Domains & Data**
- **Domains & Data**: DVTs were reviewed by the different domains (e.g., coverage, nutritional status) and indicators they covered. Indicators included in DVTs were also reviewed for their “actionability”.

**Output Structure**
- **Visualization**: Design features such as “naming, faming, and acting” techniques (includes traffic lights, color coding, etc.), profiles, and interactive dashboards with bar graphs, trend data, etc.

**Dissemination**
- **Dissemination**: Dissemination features (e.g., times of launch or updates) were reviewed across DVTs.

2 **Stakeholder consultations**

**DVT producers**
- 10 DVT producers were interviewed regarding:
  - Their DVT’s theory of change, outputs, dissemination processes, engagement strategies with users, and production/maintenance of the DVT
  - Who uses their DVT, how people are using their DVT, and any feedback (positive/areas for development) they have received from users

**Existing users of DVTs**
- Where possible, existing users of DVTs were interviewed regarding:
  - Organizational role and responsibilities
  - How they use the DVT to support their decision-making needs for nutrition at work
  - Strengths and challenges of the DVT in accessing and using data, as well as the DVT’s value add relative to other DVTs
  - User’s experiences with data

**Notes:**
1 Actionable indicators provide data that can be acted upon to improve performance and management at the program and systems levels.
Goal classification: Accountability, PIM, or Both

Three criteria were used to classify the goal of a DVT as Accountability, Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring (PIM), or both. DVTs were classified as one of these typologies if they met 2 of 3 criteria for a particular typology – e.g., if a DVT met 2 out of the 3 criteria for accountability, it would be classified as an accountability DVT.

1. Percentage of actionable indicators
   Found within enabling environment, enacted legislation, and coverage domains, the number of actionable indicators were counted in all DVTs, then divided by their total number of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive indicators.

   - DVTs with <60% actionable indicators = Accountability
   - DVTs with ≥60% actionable indicators = PIM

2. DVT output typology
   - **Scorecards** compare performance across units, often used for advocacy and accountability purposes, including ‘naming, faming, and acting’. (Scorecards often feature traffic light color-coding)
   - **Indices** aggregate several indicators into a simple metric (or composite score) to rank units, often used for advocacy and accountability purposes like ‘naming, faming, and acting’. (Indices frequently produce composite scores and often feature traffic light color-coding)
   - **Dashboards** present key performance indicators to achieve goals on a single screen – at a glance, often used for operations or management. (Dashboards are often interactive DVTs that allow the user to alter the input data to create different scenarios)
   - **Profiles** provide a snapshot of how a geographic region is doing in a particular sector, often used to spread awareness across broad audiences. (Profiles are frequently static outputs with a high number of indicators)

   - Scorecards and Indices = Accountability
   - Dashboards and Profiles = PIM

3. Key word search
   Key words were identified in DVTs’ descriptions or goal statements

   - Accountable, SDG, commitment, target, attention = Accountability
   - Plan, monitor, implement, coverage, action, program = PIM

METHODS: GOAL & AUDIENCE
Indicator mapping: Two indicator mappings were conducted, focusing on actionable indicators and overlapping indicators

**Actionable indicator mapping**

- **Purpose:** To identify actionable nutrition indicators across and within DVTs, as well as which ones are most commonly reported.

- **Methods:** We defined actionable indicators as providing data that can be acted upon to improve performance and management at the program and systems levels. For our indicator mapping, we classified indicators in the following 3 domains as actionable:
  - Enabling environment
  - Enacted legislations
  - Coverage

Please note that this mapping only included nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive indicators

**Overlapping indicator mapping**

- **Purpose:** To identify common nutrition indicators across and within DVTs.

- **Methods:**
  1. Five DVTs – GNR Country Profiles, SUN MEAL Country Dashboards, WHO NLiS Country Profiles, UNICEF State of the World’s Children Report dashboard, and Countdown to 2030 dashboards – were selected for the indicator mapping because they have the largest number of indicators and cover a broad range of domains.
  2. All nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive indicators in a DVT were included.
  3. Aspirational indicators – defined as indicators for which definitions may exist but there is no data – were excluded.
  4. Indicators covering the same topic were grouped and counted as one indicator to facilitate topical comparisons (e.g., women’s anemia <11 g/dl and <12 g/dl HgB).

Notes:
1. This analysis includes nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive indicators. For nutrition-sensitive indicators, only indicators measuring interventions with clear evidence of impact on nutrition outcomes and intermediate outcomes were included. ([Synthesis of Evidence of Multisectoral Approaches for Improved Nutrition](https://example.com), November 2017, Banking on Nutrition Partnership.)
Dissemination: Dissemination information was researched to determine the frequency, audience, and method of targeting users.

Data sources
We searched the following locations:

- DVT websites
- Event press releases
- Twitter

Data points collected
The following data points were collected from the 3 data sources previously mentioned:

- **Type**
  Was the DVT launched publicly for the first time? Or, was it refreshed/updated?

- **Date**
  When was DVT launched or refreshed?

- **Platform**
  How was the DVT launched? At an in-person event? Online? Or, both?

- **Audience**
  Which types of stakeholders is the DVT targeting?
Stakeholder consultations: DVT producers and users

Selection of stakeholders

- **DVT Producers**: We interviewed DVT producers from other sectors with well-known DVTs (i.e., malaria and PHC), and within nutrition, we interviewed DVT producers that are most used within the nutrition community (e.g., GNR Country Profiles), represent a range of goals, or producers we had existing relationships with (e.g., ACTION, R4D Invest in Nutrition)
- **DVT Users**: Where possible, we spoke to users of existing DVTS we were able to identify (please note this only applied for HANCI)

### Nutrition DVTs

1. ACTION Nutrition for Growth Accountability Tool
2. Countdown to 2030 Country Dashboards
4. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) Global Burden of Disease Compare Tool
5. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) Non-Communicable Disease Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD RisC) DVT
6. Results for Development (R4D)/ World Bank Invest in Nutrition
8. Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index (HANCI) Country Scorecards

### HANCI Users

1. Civil Society for Scaling up Nutrition in Nepal (CS-SUNN)
2. Partnership for Nutrition in Tanzania (PANITA)
3. Stellenbosch University

### Other sector DVTs

1. African Leaders Malaria Alliance (ALMA) Scorecard
2. World Bank Doing Business Index
3. Results for Development (R4D) Primary Healthcare Performance Initiative

### Goal of initiative

To end malnutrition in all forms by bringing different stakeholders together to work collaboratively, resulting in mobilized resources and aligned implementation, leading to better results and impact; improved nutrition will contribute to all SDGs.

To accelerate momentum to achieve the SDGs for ending preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths by improving equitable, cost-effective intervention coverage/equity across the continuum of care.

### Indicator selection

- Indicators are mapped against global initiatives (i.e. SDGs, MIYCN, GNR) and build on **SUN specific exercises** (e.g. Joint Annual Assessment, Networks’ Assessment, Donor spending reviews and National Budget Analyses) that discuss institutional transformations and spending (providing data for several enabling environment and finance indicators).
- Indicators are separated into 8 domains that reflect **the progression through the steps** in the SUN Movement’s TOC.
- **Indicators available across most countries** are pulled from publicly accessible sources to ensure comparability and standardization.
- Indicators are ranked by tiers then **reviewed and validated by a technical group of experts**.
- **Evidence reviews** were conducted at the outset, and ongoing review is used to update indicators (e.g. data collection, new interventions).
- Indicators are mapped against **global initiatives** (i.e. SDGs, Family Planning 2020, GNR, and the Monitoring Framework for the Global Strategy for Women’s, Children’s and Adolescent Health) and separated by demographic, coverage/equity, and determinants/drivers.

### Where indicators are displayed in DVTs

- **Country dashboards** display a core set of 79 indicators to track against the SUN MEAL theory of change and assess country performance in reference to other SUN countries or to international standard cut offs.
- **Dataset** includes dashboard indicators and raw data used to construct several indicators.
- **Baseline Document** includes dashboard indicators and aspirational indicators\(^1\) with sources and definitions.

### Countdown Country Dashboards

- **Tier 1** indicators are displayed on the static **2-page profiles**.
- **Tier 2** indicators and Tier 1 indicators are displayed on the interactive dashboards.
- **Tier 3** aspirational indicators\(^1\) listed in this document are not displayed due to lack of data.

---

**Notes:**

1. Aspirational indicators are indicators for which indicator definitions may exist but there is no data. Specifically, SUN MEAL and Countdown have included indicators in the MEAL framework and Countdown tier 3 indicator list but are not shown in the visualizations due to lack of data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVT</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEASURING PROGRESS TOWARDS ENDING MALNUTRITION</td>
<td>To measure progress towards the adoption of national level nutrition targets and their quality in 50 high-burden countries and hold countries accountable on their performance</td>
<td>Countries are assigned a color-coded score based on the following cut offs: green = 24-29 points, yellow = 20-23 points, orange = 12-19 points, red = 0-9 points. Components of the score include: Existence of a target (2 points for a target in national policies, 1 point for a “Nutrition for Growth” target), Quality of the target (either the target integrated in the national plan or the N4G target, 4 points), Progress to meet WHA global targets (3 points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANCI Country Scorecards</td>
<td>To provide information on which areas governments are failing to act will result in increased accountability, leading government policymakers, campaigners, and communities to action.</td>
<td>Countries are assigned a color based on composite scores that are from indicators in two domains: hunger and nutrition. Each of these two domains receive equal weight, each accounting for 50% of a country’s overall score. Within these two domains, there are three themes of indicators: (1) public spending, (2) policies, and (3) laws, totaling 22 indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling Up Nutrition</td>
<td>To track progress towards meeting nutrition goals and creating an enabling environment for nutrition in countries that have joined the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement.</td>
<td>Country performance on indicator 1.4: Existence of WHA targets in nutrition plans is displayed on slide 19, defined as Availability of the 6 WHA targets in plans (U5 child stunting, U5 child wasting, U5 child overweight, low-birth weight, anemia among women of reproductive age and exclusive breastfeeding for the first six months). Color coding cut-offs include: red = critical (no WHA targets in policy), yellow = poor (1-2 WHA targets in policy), blue = moderate (3-4 WHA targets in policy) and green = good (5-6 WHA targets in policy).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Methodologies of DVTs with color coding / rankings (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVT</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLOBAL HUNGER INDEX</strong></td>
<td>To raise awareness and understanding of the struggle against hunger, provide a way to compare levels of hunger between countries and regions, and call attention to those areas of the world where hunger levels are highest and where the need for additional efforts to eliminate hunger is greatest.</td>
<td>Countries receive a GHI score, calculated by three steps: (1) For each country, values are determined for undernourishment, child wasting, child stunting, and child mortality. (2) Each of these four indicators is given a standardized score on a 100-point scale based on the highest observed level for the indicator on a global scale in recent decades. (3) Standardized scores are aggregated to calculate the GHI score for each country, with each of the three dimensions (inadequate food supply; child mortality; and child undernutrition, which is composed equally of child stunting and child wasting) given equal weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition for Growth Accountability Tool</td>
<td>To track the ambition and delivery of N4G commitments by key government and philanthropic donors, and it points out what is needed to meet global goals for improved nutrition.</td>
<td>Donor’s commitments are assessed by pulling information on commitments from the N4G Executive Summary. Nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive definitions are also taken from this summary. Four criteria were used to assess ambition, including (1) Did the donor include a pledge through 2020? (2) Did the pledge represent an increase above baseline? (3) Was a financial pledge of any kind included? (4) Did the pledge specifically mention an amount for nutrition-specific funding? Using these criteria, ambition ratings were assigned as inadequate (0-1 criteria met), business as usual (2-3 criteria met) and ambitious (3-4 criteria met).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLOBAL BREASTFEEDING SCORECARD</strong></td>
<td>To encourage progress, increase accountability, and document change for all countries as they take the necessary steps to protect, promote, and support breastfeeding.</td>
<td>Countries’ performance is displayed across separate color-coded indicators. Data is pulled from publicly accessible sources and color coding cut offs are set differently for each indicator. For example, the rates of continued breastfeeding at two years are coded as green (&gt; 80% of infants continue breastfeeding until two years of age), yellow (60-80%), orange (40-60%), and red (&lt;40%). All data sources and color coding cutoffs are accessible on the website’s methodology page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actionable indicators included in DVTs (1/7)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Existence and composition of multi-stakeholder platforms: proportion of countries report having a functioning MSP mechanism <em>(SUN MEAL)</em> / Whether a multisectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism exists <em>(HANCI)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Capacity of MSP to coordinate their partners response to identified annual priority action areas in the Joint Annual Assessment¹ <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Existence, composition and functionality of networks/alliances (UN agencies, CSOs, business): number and type of networks in place <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Nutrition governance score (&quot;strong&quot;, &quot;medium&quot; or &quot;weak&quot;, depending on the presence of a set of elements identified by countries themselves as crucial for successful development and implementation of national nutrition policies and strategies) <em>(WHO NLiS)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement¹ <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Civil society involvement in review of national maternal, newborn and child health programs <em>(Countdown)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>SMART-ness of nutrition commitments by governments and networks / alliances made since the beginning of 2016 <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>‘Good’ quality of new national multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder action plans/CRF made since the beginning of 2016 <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Engagement of high-level advocates (champions, parliamentarians, media) <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Demographic and Health Survey / Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey / comparable national nutrition survey was conducted in the past three years <em>(HANCI)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Information systems for nutrition index score (based on three groups of indicators: a) government commitment &amp; enabling environment; b) national assessment data; c) national performance monitoring data) <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Existence of a regulatory or administrative agency to ensure the safety and health of food <em>(Global Food Security Index)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Geographic distribution of resources at subnational level (linked with mapping of stakeholders and actions) <em>(SUN MEAL)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Density for each of: physicians (includes generalist and specialist medical practitioners) nurses (Includes nursing and nursing associate professionals, midwifery and midwifery associate professionals. Does not include traditional midwives) <em>(SUN MEAL)</em> / Population density of health workers (per 1000 population) - includes physicians, nurses and midwives, and community health workers <em>(GNR)</em> / Proportion of physicians, nurses and midwives who are available per 10,000 population <em>(Countdown)</em> / The number of trained nutrition professionals per 100,000 population in the country in a specified year <em>(WHO NLiS)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Number/percent of health workers trained on SAM treatment <em>(State of Acute Malnutrition)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>SAM treatment is included in training curricula for health professionals and community workers <em>(State of Acute Malnutrition)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1 Please note these indicators are specific to measuring the progress of the SUN Movement.
Enabling Environment

Private sector engagement

17. (A) Corporate strategy, management and governance (12.5% of index score): corporate nutrition strategy, nutrition governance and management systems, and quality of reporting
18. (B) Formulating appropriate products (25% of index score): product formulation and nutrient profiling
19. (C) Delivering affordable, accessible products (20% of index score): F&B product pricing and F&B product distribution
20. (D) Responsible marketing policies, compliance and spending (20% of index score): responsible market policy and auditing and compliance with policy for all consumers and for children
21. (E) Supporting healthy diets and active lifestyles (2.5% of index score): supporting staff health and wellness, supporting breastfeeding mothers in the workplace, and supporting consumer-oriented healthy diet and active lifestyle programs
22. (F) Product labeling and use of health and nutrition claims (15% of index score): nutrition labeling, health and nutrition complaints
23. (G) Engagement with governments, policymakers and other stakeholders (5% of index score): lobbying and influencing governments and policymakers and stakeholder engagement

Other

24. Existence of an institutional, legal and market framework for secure land tenure and the procedure for land acquisition and accessibility to all (HANCI)
25. Functioning of social protection systems (HANCI) / Presence of food safety-net programs to protect the poor from food-related shocks (Global Food Security Index)
26. Governments promote complementary feeding practices of children aged 6–9 months and continued breastfeeding of children at ages 12–15 and 20–23 months (HANCI)
27. Nutrition monitoring and surveillance (National Anemia Profiles) / Government monitors the nutritional status of the general population (Global Food Security Index)
28. RUTF is on the national essential supplies list (State of Acute Malnutrition)
29. To what extent the agricultural research and extension system is accessible to poor farmers, including women farmers, and is responsive to the needs and priorities of the poor farmers (HANCI)
30. Women’s legal rights and de facto rights to own and/or access agricultural land (HANCI)

Notes:
1 Please note only the indicators that were used to construct the index score for ATNI’s corporate profiles are included along with what weighting those indicators were given to construct the index score. The full description of the indicators are included in the ATNI 2018 report. Please also note that this review of the ATNI does not include the product profiles or BMS marketing.
Nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive financing

By government
31. Country has funding available for SAM treatment programs (State of Acute Malnutrition)
32. Country has funding available for SAM treatment supplies (State of Acute Malnutrition)
33. General government expenditure on health as % of gross domestic product (Countdown to 2030; WHO NLiS) / Total expenditure on health as % of gross domestic product; Per capita total expenditure on health (Countdown)
34. Government has separate budget line for nutrition (HANCI)
35. National budget spending for nutrition (Based on (a) budget analysis completeness, (b) budget spending per child U5 for nutrition-specific, and (c) percentage budgeted for nutrition-specific spending) (SUN MEAL)
36. Public expenditure data, percentage of health, education, social protection and agriculture in total spending (GNR) / Government expenditure on health, per capita (Countdown) / General government expenditure on health as a percentage of total government expenditure (WHO NLiS; Countdown; HANCI) / Proportion of total government spending on essential services: education, health, and social protection (SUN MEAL)

By donor
37. Donor funding for breastfeeding, calculated by dividing the amount of donor funding earmarked for exclusive breastfeeding by the number of live births in a country (UNICEF/WHO Global Breastfeeding Scorecard)
38. Donor funding for nutrition (only CRS basic code for nutrition) (Based on (a) donor spending per stunted child U5 for nutrition, (b) donor spending per child U5 for high-impact interventions, (c) percentage budgeted for nutrition-specific spending) (SUN MEAL)
39. Status of nutrition-sensitive pledge delivery by donor (ACTION Nutrition for Growth Accountability Tool)
40. Status of nutrition-specific pledge delivery by donor (ACTION Nutrition for Growth Accountability Tool)
41. The agriculture orientation index for government expenditures (Calculated as the ratio of Agriculture Share of Government Expenditures to the Agriculture Share of GDP) (SUN MEAL) / Government expenditures on agriculture as share of total government expenditures (%) (HANCI) / Public expenditure on agricultural research and development (Global Food Security Index)

Other
42. Cost needed to achieve WHA target (Investing in Nutrition)
43. Financing gap for costed nutrition high-impact interventions (SUN MEAL)
44. Gap of funds needed to achieve WHA targets (Investing in Nutrition)
45. Percent of funds needed from a given stakeholder group or fund to achieve WHA targets (Investing in Nutrition)

Notes:
1 Investing in Nutrition includes separate indicators for stunting, wasting, exclusive breastfeeding, anemia, and stunting.
2 Investing in Nutrition includes separate indicators for donors, domestic, innovative, and household funds.
Enacted Legislations

**BMS Code, Maternity Protection, Constitutional Right to Food, and marketing of foods**

46. Country has legislation on the Constitutional Right to Food (*SUN MEAL*) / Assessed level of constitutional protection of the right to food (*GNR*) / Level of constitutional protection of the right to food (*HANCI*)

47. Country has maternity protection laws or regulations in place in line with the ILO Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183) and Recommendation No. 191 (*SUN MEAL*) / Country has ratified International Labour Organization Convention 183 or has passed national legislation that is in compliance with the three key provisions of the convention (*Countdown; GNR; WHO NLIS*) / Meets recommended provisions of Recommendation 191 (at least 18 weeks of maternity leave, 100% of previous earnings paid for by a social programme) (*UNICEF/WHO Global Breastfeeding Scorecard*)


**Food fortification**

50. Country has legal documentation specifying nutrient levels for fortification (*SUN MEAL*) / Amount of each nutrient required in fortified foods, according to a country’s fortification standards (*GFDx*)

51. Country has legal documentation that has the effect of allowing or mandating food fortification (*SUN MEAL*) / National status of legislation on food fortification of wheat, rice or maize (*Countdown*) / Country has official documentation and/or food standard that provides guidance or regulations for fortification “voluntary fortification” or legal documentation that has the effect of mandating fortification of food with one or more vitamins or minerals “mandatory fortification” (*GFDx*)

52. Country has official documentation and/or a food standard that provides guidance or regulations for fortification (“voluntary fortification”) or legal documentation that has the effect of mandating fortification of a food with one or more vitamins or minerals (“mandatory fortification”), or countries that have written standards for the nutrients added in fortification (“fortification standards”) (*GFDx*)

53. The total number of nutrients in fortified foods, according to a country’s fortification standards (*GFDx*)

**Notes:**

1. The GFDx includes separate indicators for maize, oil, rice, salt, and wheat.
2. The GFDx includes separate indicators for Calcium, Fluoride, Folate, Iodine, Iron, Niacin, Riboflavin, Selenium, Thiamin, Vitamin A, Vitamin B12, Vitamin B6, Vitamin D, Vitamin E, and zinc.
**Enacted Legislations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actionable indicators included in DVTs (5/7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= indicator not currently reported in specified DVT due to lack of data, but ideally would be reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusion of nutrition in national policies, plans, or strategies**

54. Availability of the 3 nutrition-related NCD targets in plans (overweight/obesity in adults, diabetes, salt intake) *(SUN MEAL)*

55. Availability of the 6 WHA targets in national plans *(SUN MEAL; Measuring Progress Towards Ending Malnutrition)*

56. Governments identify time bound nutrition targets in public policy documents *(HANCI)*

57. Integration of overnutrition in national development plans and economic growth strategies: assesses to what extent undernutrition and overnutrition features in key multiyear national development and economic growth strategies such as Five-Year Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategy papers, Vision 2020/2030 documents, and so forth *(SUN MEAL; GNR)*

58. Integration of undernutrition in national development plans and economic growth strategies: assesses to what extent undernutrition and overnutrition features in key multiyear national development and economic growth strategies such as Five-Year Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategy papers, Vision 2020/2030 documents, and so forth *(SUN MEAL; GNR)*

59. Nutrition features in national development policy (based on a key word search) *(HANCI)*

60. National Nutrition Policy/Strategy exists *(HANCI; Global Food Security Index)*

61. Quality WHA target in national plan or N4G target: target is beyond 2017, runs until 2025, and is time bound *(Measuring Progress Towards Ending Malnutrition)*

62. SAM treatment is included in national policies *(State of Acute Malnutrition)*

**Other**

63. Breastfeeding policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

64. Delayed cord clamping policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

65. Dietary diversity for complementary feeding policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

66. IPTp for pregnant women policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

67. Iron and/or folic acid fortification legislation exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

68. Iron and folic acid supplementation for pregnant women policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

69. Iron and folic acid supplementation for women of reproductive age policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

70. Iron and folic acid supplementation for adolescent girls policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

71. Long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) for household use policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

72. Micronutrient Powders for children policy exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)*

73. National dietary guidelines exist *(SPRING Anemia Profiles; Global Food Security Index)*

74. Nutritional standards exists *(SPRING Anemia Profiles)* / Extent of government commitment to increasing nutritional standards via national dietary guidelines, a national nutrition plan or strategy, and nutrition monitoring and surveillance *(Global Food Security Index)*

**Notes:**

1. Measuring Progress Towards Ending Malnutrition assesses four WHA targets: wasting, stunting, exclusive breastfeeding, and anemia

2. The SPRING Anemia Profiles include the status of a policy based on information pulled from the Global database on the Implementation of Nutrition Action (GINA) or country documentation.
Maternal and infant/child coverage indicators

75. Proportion of hospitals and maternity facilities that are designated as a “Baby Friendly” institution (SUN MEAL; UNICEF/WHO Global Breastfeeding Scorecard)

76. Percentage of women aged 15 to 49 with a live birth in a given time period that received antenatal care four or more times (GNR) / Percentage of women attended four or more times during pregnancy by any provider (Countdown) / Antenatal care - at least 1 visit (State of the World’s Children) / Percentage of women aged 15–49 years attended at least once during pregnancy by skilled health personnel (doctor, nurse or midwife) (HANCI)

77. Percentage of women with a birth in the five years preceding the survey who took iron tablets or syrup (none/ for <60 days to 90+ days/for 90+ days) (SUN MEAL) / Percentage of pregnant women who received iron/folic acid supplementation for 90 or more days (Countdown) / Proportion of women who consumed any iron-containing supplements during the current or past pregnancy within the last 2 years (WHO NLiS) / Percentage of pregnant women who received IFA during their pregnancy (any; took <60; took 60-69; took 90+)

78. Percent of districts offering community breastfeeding programs (Global Breastfeeding Scorecard)

79. Percent of primary healthcare facilities offering individual IYCF counseling (Global Breastfeeding Scorecard) / Percent of mothers of children aged 0-23 months who have received counselling, support or messages on optimal breastfeeding at least once in the last year (WHO NLiS) ¹

80. Children under 5 with diarrhea receiving ORS (GNR) / Prevalence of children under age 5 who received oral rehydration therapy (WHO NLiS) / Percent of children under 5 with diarrhea treated with oral rehydration salts (State of the World’s Children)

81. Percentage of children under 5 with diarrhea receiving oral rehydration salts (ORS packets or pre-packaged ORS fluids) and zinc (SUN MEAL) / Percentage of children ages 0–59 months with diarrhea receiving treatment with low osmolarity oral rehydration solution and zinc supplement (Countdown) / Percentage of children under 5 years with acute diarrhea who were given supplements of 20 mg zinc daily for 10-14 days or 10 mg/day for infants under 6 months (WHO NLiS)

82. Proportion of 6- to 59-month-olds receiving two high-dose vitamin A supplements (SUN MEAL) / Percentage of children age 6–59 months reached with two doses of vitamin A supplements approximately four to six months apart in a calendar year (Countdown) / Proportion of children aged 6–59 months who received two high-dose vitamin A supplements in a (given) calendar year (GNR; Vitamin A Supplementation Dashboard) / Proportion of children aged 6-59 months who receive one or two high doses of vitamin A supplements within 1 year (WHO NLiS; HANCI) / Vitamin A supplementation, full coverage (State of the World’s Children)

83. Percent of children 6-23 months receiving micronutrient powders – based on estimates from 32 SUN countries, over 5 million children 6-23 months received MNPs in 2015 (SUN MEAL)

84. Percentage of children under age 5 who slept under an insecticide-treated mosquito net the night prior to the survey (SUN MEAL; SPRING Anemia Profiles)

85. Number/percent of health facilities offering/providing SAM treatment (State of Acute Malnutrition)

86. Number of admissions in children under 6 months for SAM treatment (State of Acute Malnutrition)

87. Proportion of children 6–59 months with severe acute malnutrition admitted for treatment (SUN MEAL) / Number of children 6-59 months admitted for SAM treatment (State of Acute Malnutrition) / Severe acute malnutrition geographical coverage (Countdown)

Notes:
¹ The Vitamin A Supplementation Dashboard also has an indicator for one-dose Vitamin A supplementation coverage
Coverage

**Other coverage indicators**

88. Percent of population participating in social protection and labor programs *(SUN MEAL)*

89. Percentage of surveyed households which have salt they used for cooking that tested positive (>0ppm) for presence of iodine *(SUN MEAL)* / Percent of households with salt iodine content ≥ 15 parts per million (ppm) *(GNR)* / Households consuming salt with any iodine (>0 ppm, %) *(Countdown)* / Households consuming iodized salt containing 15-40 parts per million of iodine *(WHO NLiS)* / Percent of households with iodized salt *(World Bank Nutrition Country Profiles)* / Percent of households consuming salt with iodine *(State of the World’s Children Dashboard)* / Households with available iodized salt *(Countdown)*

90. Percentage of the population consuming food that is fortified according to standards (% uses vehicle, % fortifiable, and % fortified) for oil, maize flour, and wheat flour *(SUN MEAL)*

91. Percentage of the population using at least basic drinking water service (drinking water from an improved source, provided collection time is not more than 30 minutes for a round trip, including queuing) *(SUN MEAL)* / Population using drinking water from an improved source provided collection time is not more than 30 minutes for a roundtrip including queuing; compliant with fecal and priority chemical standards *(Countdown)* / Percentage of the population using improved drinking water sources *(GNR)* / Percentage of population with access to an improved drinking-water source *(WHO NLiS; HANCI)* / Percentage of population using basic drinking water services *(FAO Country Indicators)* / Percentage of people using at least basic drinking water services, namely piped water, boreholes or tubewells, protected, dug wells, protected springs, and packaged or delivered water *(Global Food Security Index)*

92. Proportion of population using a safely managed sanitation service *(SUN MEAL)* / Percent of population using an improved sanitation facility that is not shared with other households *(Countdown; HANCI)* / Percentage of the population using improved sanitation facilities *(GNR; WHO NLiS)* / Percent of population using basic sanitation services *(FAO Country Indicators)*

= indicator not currently reported in specified DVT due to lack of data, but ideally would be reported = indicator used in select DVTs