Investing in Nutrition

In 2012, the World Health Assembly endorsed global targets to improve maternal and child nutrition by 2025 — an ambitious vision now reflected in the Sustainable Development Goals. The 2013 Nutrition for Growth (N4G) event — where donors pledged $US 4.15 billion for nutrition-specific and $US 19 billion for nutrition-sensitive programs — was an essential step on the long-neglected road to support country-owned efforts to improve child nutrition.

ACTION’s scorecard tracks the ambition and delivery of N4G commitments, providing a baseline measurement for future pledge delivery and a progress report for donors who set earlier deadlines. Consistent and accessible reporting is essential for tracking to be accurate and meaningful. While these commitments are critical to meeting global targets, they are indicators for global progress rather than an exhaustive list of funding.

Overall, it’s clear that donors must meet existing commitments and also considerably increase nutrition investments to meet globally-agreed targets. At an August 2016 summit in Brazil, donors must build on N4G momentum with increased commitments.
### Australia
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 372m): ON TRACK (2013-2020)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 2,304m): ON TRACK (2013-2020)

As Australia pledged only through 2017 at N4G — with only USD 126m being new money — a more ambitious nutrition-specific pledge is needed to 2020.

### Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 492m): ON TRACK (2013-2020)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 531m): ON TRACK (2013-2020)

The Gates Foundation should commit to an accelerated disbursement of its existing nutrition-sensitive pledge to meet targets for 2020. The Foundation’s announcement in June 2015 that it will increase its investments in nutrition to USD 770m over the next 6 years is encouraging.

### Canada
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 141m): (no timeline)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 50m): (no timeline)

Canada should make a bold commitment that matches the leadership they have shown globally on maternal and child health.

### Children’s Investment Fund
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 793m): 2013-2020
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 4,032m): 2013

The EU’s pledge went beyond business as usual, with USD 440m (EUR 340m) additional to baseline spending. The EU disbursement USD 574.95m in 2013 to nutrition-sensitive work. Much higher annual nutrition-specific disbursements per annum are needed to fulfill targets set by 2015-2020. While disbursement data was not reported, nutrition-sensitive commitments of USD 166.9m (EUR 130.4m) and USD 87.8m (EUR 68.7m) in humanitarian aid for nutrition are encouraging, though there is room for improvement to match the rate of disbursement needed to hit USD 4,032m over 7 years. Reporting disbursements measures the capacity of the EU to deliver on its commitments, and the impact it has on the ground.

### France
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 293m): 2013-2020
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 4,032m): 2013

France must make a strong financial pledge in 2016.

### Germany
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 169m): 2013-2020
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 4,032m): 2013

While Germany is on track to deliver its aggregated pledge, it should make an additional financial pledge amplifi ed by nutrition-sensitive funding. Germany is on track for its nutrition-specific pledge, disbursement of USD 1,838m to nutrition-specific programmes in 2013. However, 2012 disbursements of USD 734.7m to nutrition-sensitive programmes were below the amount needed to meet its pledge.

### Ireland
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 169m): 2013-2020
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 4,032m): 2013

Ireland is capable of making a more ambitious pledge to 2020 on both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive work, but should be commended for its transparency and on-track disbursements.

### The Netherlands
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 195m): 2013-2020
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 4,032m): 2013

The Netherlands should provide an update on progress against its commitments between now and 2016, and should increase its pledge to match its level of commitment to food security and rural development work.

### Norway
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 0m): (no timeline)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 0m): (no timeline)

Norway should make an ambitious pledge given its wider commitment to the health of women and children, education, and gender issues.

### United Kingdom
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 1,304m): (2013-2020)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 3,244m): (2013-2020)

As a member of the international committee for N4G 2016, the UK should continue to leverage a whole-of-government approach to investments for nutrition and encourage other donors to make ambitious pledges in 2016, in addition to matching its disbursements in 2013.

### United States
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 1,096m): (2012-2014)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 8,919m): (2012-2014)

While the U.S. pledge included no new money for 2014 and only USD 916m for nutrition-sensitive disbursements, the 2012 USD 1,044m baseline disbursements to nutrition are encouraging. We welcome the U.S. reporting USD 1.8bn in nutrition-sensitive disbursements in 2015. The pending whole of government coordination plan is an important opportunity to maximize the impact of these funds.

### World Bank Group
- **Nutrition-Specific** (USD 500m): (2013-2020)
- **Nutrition-Sensitive** (USD 0m): (2013-2020)

The Bank should report on a new, bold agenda proposed to protect nutrition across sectors that integrate nutrition programming, and encourage scaling up in the highest burden countries.
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ACTION is a global partnership working to influence policy and mobilize resources to fight diseases of poverty and achieve equitable access to health.

Notes on Methodology

Nutrition for Growth Pledge: All Nutrition for Growth commitments, as well as calculations of increased commitments above baseline levels are from the N4G Executive Summary. Nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive definitions are also taken from this summary.

Ambition: Criteria considered in assessing ambition of individual N4G pledges included:
• Did the donor include a pledge through 2020?
• Did the pledge represent an increase above baseline?
• Was a financial pledge of any kind included?
• Did the pledge specifically mention an amount for nutrition-specific funding?

2013 Pledge Delivery: Pledge delivery analysis is based on an assumed constant annual rate of disbursement over each donor’s stated pledge period, with a 10% margin of error allowed in judging on-target delivery. pledged amounts are based on the original pledges and are represented in current US dollars. This methodology is in line with the SUN Donor Network Methodology and Guidance Note to Track Global Investments in Nutrition.

A complete methodology explanation with links can be found at: http://www.action.org/resources/item/following-the-nutrition-funding