**Annex: MIYCF-E Integration**

# **Training Outcomes for MIYCF-E**

The training was conducted over 2 days with 2 additional days of bi-lateral discussions to go over specific action plans with WFP and their in-field partners.

**Training Day 1 and 2: (18 and 19 Feb)**

Day one included an overview by WFP HQ staff on WFP strategy, nutrition sensitive programming, including group work to provide background and understanding the challenges of the incorporation of nutrition into programmes at field level. Day two focused heavily on the practical aspects of integration including the creation of action plans and M&E plans.

Within the agenda during day one and two of the training there was space for the Tech RRT advisor to join the group discussions, ask questions to understand the context and current practices, and provide practical feedback on MIYCFE integration into action plans. These were face to face meetings focused on programmes from the livelihoods, refugee, and emergency response as WFP felt these were the most appropriate areas for MIYCFE interventions to be embedded.

**Action Plan Development Discussions: Refugees, Climate Change, and Emergency Response**

Refugee, Climate Change, and Emergency Response programmes were grouped together as their action plans are similar. Primary discussions included outlining of each programme which involved food distribution, agricultural activities including seed harvesting, voucher programmes, and cash distribution. The teams felt that they had nutrition sensitive programmes but when asked about MIYCFE they agreed that there was little in the way of MIYCFE sensitive programming. Teams felt that training was required in-field with hands on support. A main concern that the discussions brought up was the fact that beneficiaries of the unconditional cash distribution who were breastfeeding were using the cash to purchase infant formula and bottles thereby increasing risk to the breastfeeding infant and reducing money available to the rest of the family for other food and non-food items. As a result, messaging and potential conditions such as engagement with an MIYCF counselling programme was included in the action plan for consideration.

There were no final plans available by the end of the week deployment, the final plans will be seen during Phase 2 of the mission. However, suggestions included MIYCFE messaging, possible conditions on cash distribution requiring families to receive some engagement with MIYCFE focal points, messaging in the food baskets, etc.

**Action Plan Development Discussions: Livelihoods**

Livelihood action plan primary discussions included outlining livelihood programmes which include income generation, kitchen gardens, work programmes. Women who become pregnant and who are working within WFP livelihood programmes are excused from working from their 4th month until the child is 1 year old. During this time, they still receive benefits from WFP but it was unclear during the discussion exactly what this was. There are no childcare facilities next to the working locations and there are not breaks for breastfeeding mothers. MIYCFE interventions were discussed and those that felt applicable and appropriate to the project managers were included. This included working locations being close to homes for PLW and caregivers of children 0 to 23 months and breastfeeding breaks. These were included for consideration into the action plans.

**Bi-Lateral Engagement Discussions**

During the bi-lateral discussions (day 4 and 5) the Tech RRT MIYCFE advisor gathered more contextual information and provided more feedback on WFP action plans that partners will be working within. Currently there are no specific MIYCFE interventions or integration including targeting, messaging, or referrals. The Tech RRT advisor used the Save the Children and the UNHCR Multi-sectoral Framework as a tool for discussion and the WFP Nutrition Sensitive Guidance, specifically the Nutrition-Sensitive check list for nutrition-sensitive programming as a guiding reference and tool for the project managers. ***Through these discussions more specific actions were outlined to be included in the action plans, however, the partners felt that without appropriate training they would not be able to fully implement the MIYCFE aspects of the plans.***

Bi-lateral Discussion Findings:

* While there are some interventions within the livelihood projects that specifically target women, partners do not specifically target or have demographics specifically related to PLW or Caregivers of 0-23 months or children <5
* Main activities were food distribution, livelihood project including kitchen gardens, cash distribution and agricultural projects. There are no specific nutrition sensitive activities.
* There were no breastfeeding corners and limited places to sit in WFP distribution settings.
* When discussing ways to integrate MIYCFE into the action plans, as expected by the Tech RRT advisor, partners felt that they weren’t sure what activities would be appropriate as they had no capacity to understand MIYCFE and indicated a training would be helpful.
  + Advisor walked through ways MIYCFE could be incorporated into the action plans including a shaded area for breastfeeding, prioritizing PLW or caregivers of children <23 months in distribution lines, specific targeting of PLW, etc. While partners were open to these activities, they still felt that without training they would not be able to include them in the action plans or implement them. This was expected and a discussion with WFP regarding sensitization sessions during Phase 2 was had between WFP and the Tech RRT Advisor. These sensitization sessions have since been included in the draft ToR for phase 2.
* Within the Refugee Camps UNHCR has taken the lead with MIYCFE, although the WFP Refugee project manager is unsure of what the specific activities were. Conducting a capacity assessment and mapping has been included in the draft ToR for phase 2 to better understand what MIYCFE support is available in country.