



# Nutrition for Growth

*Methodology*

November 2021

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Stakeholder typology and commitment types .....	4
Nutrition for Growth (N4G) survey .....	5
Commitment assessments .....	6
Constituencies.....	7
Donor constituency .....	7
Business constituency .....	16
CSO constituency .....	20
UN agency constituency .....	21
‘Other’ constituency .....	21
Multiple commitments as one .....	23
Analysis methodology for the <i>2021 Global Nutrition Report</i> .....	24
Standardisation of commitments for progress reporting .....	24
Thematic analysis of alignment to global nutrition targets.....	26
Endnotes.....	27

# Introduction

The Global Nutrition Report has been bringing together and analysing the best available data on nutrition since 2014. We were born out of the first Nutrition for Growth (N4G) Summit and continue to provide the evidence needed to drive action to end malnutrition in all its forms.

Our N4G Commitment Tracker provides the latest data on progress towards N4G commitments. You can search our interactive tracker to find out who is making progress towards commitments – and where more action is needed. This makes it an important resource for anyone who needs evidence to shape stronger commitments on nutrition.

The Global Nutrition Report (GNR) tracks and monitors progress against the commitments that stakeholders<sup>1</sup> have made, either at the London 2013 N4G Summit or the Milan 2017 N4G Summit, or, outside of these summits.

This methodology outlines the approach used in the GNR for assessing N4G commitments based on the N4G Compact<sup>2</sup> and the N4G survey.

This methodology will detail the types of stakeholders that made commitments, and the ‘constituencies’ that these can be grouped into. Within each constituency, there are different types of commitment that can be made. The methodology will then detail, for each commitment type, the ‘ingredients’ that are needed to perform an assessment, and the corresponding assessment process.

# Stakeholder typology and commitment types

Stakeholders are broadly classified into different constituencies: business, country, donor, civil society organisation (CSO), UN agency and ‘Other’. These classifications were all established following the N4G 2013 summit in London and are used consistently to date. Within each constituency, the following types of commitment were made.

**Table 1. Commitment type by constituency**

BUSINESS	COUNTRY	DONOR	CSO	UN AGENCY	OTHER
Workforce	Impact	Financial	Financial	Commitment	Commitment
Non-workforce	Financial	Non-financial	Non-financial		
	Policy				
	Program				

Note: ‘Other’ includes organisations that did not fit the other constituencies such as Grand Challenges Canada, CABI, CGIAR and GAIN.

# Nutrition for Growth (N4G) survey

All stakeholders are invited to take part in the N4G survey and report recent progress against their N4G commitments. This information is self-reported. As different information is required for each constituency and commitment type, the survey includes different questions for each constituency.

The GNR team email contacts at each stakeholder with a link to a Google Form survey (<https://forms.gle/3UjAUrre6JwqcVDy9>), and a static template in Excel. Responses are monitored and managed using the [n4g@globalnutritionreport.org](mailto:n4g@globalnutritionreport.org) email address.

Data and information are extracted from the responses and stored in a spreadsheet.

Respondents are marked as 'no response' if the GNR team do not receive a response where data is clearly mapped to commitments, either as a reply to the original email or to a subsequent follow-up email. Individual commitments can also be marked as 'no response' if there is no reference to it in the reported progress. Respondents are also marked as 'no response' if no suitable contact is available.

Non-English responses are translated and returned to the respondent for their approval prior to publication.

## Commitment assessments

All assessments are performed by GNR staff using standardised protocols and extraction templates (in Excel). To ensure consistency in the assessments, one researcher performs all assessments, and a second researcher independently reviews 20% of the assessments at random. Any discrepancies are resolved through mutual discussion until both researchers reach 100% agreement.

In the case where commitments have been assessed as reached in prior N4G surveys, this result is carried forward even if the stakeholder did not submit a response for that particular commitment. If the stakeholder did submit a response for a commitment previously assessed as reached, we published the reported progress and kept the assessment as 'reached'.

Assessments, once complete, are emailed back to the respondents for their information. They have the right to an explanation of the assessment, and they may withdraw their data if they wish at any point.

# Constituencies

## Donor constituency

Donor stakeholders committed “to support countries as they reinforce and implement national nutrition plans, through mobilizing and aligning international resources, empowering country-led coordination arrangements to support the effective delivery of resources, and facilitating mutual learning and promoting South-South knowledge sharing and technical assistance.”<sup>3</sup> This took the form of financial and non-financial commitments, each of which have a different assessment approach based on different assessment ingredients. Donors, as all other constituencies, are assessed against the original intent of their commitments.

There is also an example in this constituency of multiple stakeholders to a single commitment – CIFF and Save the Children jointly made a 2013 non-financial commitment. In this case, respondents are put in touch with each other and asked to submit a joint response. This data is then confirmed as accurate with both organisations, to ensure a joint sign-off.

### Donor: Financial commitments

Donors made a commitment to finance a particular amount of nutrition-related activities. These can take the form of either financial commitments or disbursements, depending on what is specified in the N4G commitment. This is explained further in the ingredients and assessment sections that follow.

### *Ingredients*

For the 2021 N4G cycle, respondents are asked to provide financial data for the 2019 calendar year from 1 January 2019 through to 31 December 2019.

The following ingredients are used to perform the progress assessment, including reasoned assumptions and actions when these are unspecified or unclear:

#### **A. Original commitment (from Compact)**

##### **1. Indicator of financial declaration**

- i. The indicators classify the original financial declaration as a commitment (legal obligation to allocate funds) or disbursement (the actual release of funds), which determine the basis for the assessment as intended in the original Compact. Financial N4G commitments from donors pledge to disburse – or in some cases, commit – a specific fund. The specificity of the original wording is

crucial in determining whether a commitment or disbursement was made. For example, “will commit” suggests a commitment while “will spend” suggests a disbursement.

- ii. If the original wording was unclear, unspecified or contradictory (e.g. different for nutrition-specific vs nutrition-sensitive intervention), this is clarified with the respondent and updated accordingly. Any such change is clearly denoted on the donor’s N4G profile.

## **2. Amount of total financial commitments or disbursements, for the funding period**

- i. The exact total amount in the reported currency and decimal place accuracy (current prices). If reported separately for nutrition-sensitive and nutrition-specific interventions, then these are summed to derive the total amount of financial commitments.
- ii. If missing, no assessment can be performed (and is clearly denoted in the basis for assessment field on the donor’s GNR profile).

## **3. Funding period (start and end date)**

- i. Based on the exact start and end date of the funding period as reported. If calendar months were not provided, then the start was assumed as 1 January of the calendar year following the year of commitment. This is because annual data for the reported year of commitment will include activities that have taken place before the commitment was made, and is therefore not representative of the actions of the commitment. The end date is assumed as 31 December of the reported end year. Calendar months are converted to years by dividing by 12.
- ii. There are no cases where the start date is not reported. If the end date is not reported:
  - For financial declarations made at the 2013 London N4G Summit, the end date is assumed to 31 December 2020, respectively.
  - For those made at the 2017 Milan N4G summit or outside of the summits, respondents are contacted to request an end date. If this is confirmed to be ongoing, the GNR is unable to make an assessment on the pace of progress in lieu of an actual end date, and so the stakeholder is assessed as ‘on course’ if they report any relevant commitments or disbursements. No such cases are currently identified.

## **4. Average amount of total financial commitments or disbursements, annual**



- i. The total amount (A2) is divided by the duration of the funding period in years (A3) to derive the required average annual commitment or disbursement.

**5. Progress period, to date**

- i. The total number of years between the funding period start date (derived from A3) and the latest N4G survey data end date (for this year's assessment this is 31 December 2019).
- ii. If the funding period end date has already passed (progress period > funding period), this is clearly denoted in the basis for assessment field, and N4G survey continues to collect data to perform an assessment. The stakeholder can be assessed as having 'reached commitment' (see assessment section below for criteria); the GNR denotes in the basis for assessment field if this has been achieved outside the original funding period. If the commitment or disbursement has not been reached, then it is assessed as 'off course'.

**6. Cumulative 'expected' amount of financial commitments or disbursements, for the progress period**

- i. The average annual amount of financial commitment or disbursement (A4) multiplied by progress period to date in calendar years, or months where applicable (A5).
- ii. The GNR therefore assumes a linear rate of progress, unless the stakeholder clearly specifies otherwise.

**B. Data on progress (from N4G surveys)**

**1. Amount of latest total financial commitments, annual (2019)**

- i. The exact total amount in the reported currency and decimal place accuracy (in current prices). If the reported currency does not match the one of the original Compact, then it is converted using exchange rates to match the currency of the original Compact, and the source and date of download is provided. If the decimal place accuracy varies, then it is also matched to the one of the original Compact.
- ii. Nutrition-sensitive and nutrition-specific interventions are summed to derive the total amount of financial commitments.
- iii. If missing but the stakeholder has responded to the survey with non-numeric data or with data unrelated to nutrition, this is assessed as 'not clear'.
- iv. If missing due to a non-response, the assessment is 'no response'.

**2. Amount of latest total financial disbursements, annual (2019)**

- i. Same principles as above, but for disbursements.

- 3. Amount of previous total financial commitments, sum (earliest available from 2014–2018)**
  - i. As reported in previous N4G surveys (nutrition-sensitive plus nutrition-specific), matching the reported currency and decimal place accuracy of the original Compact. The earliest available year matches the start date of the funding period, with the start of the N4G survey data collection period being 2014. The endpoint corresponds to previous year before the latest N4G survey (in this case, 2018). This amount corresponds to the cumulative financial commitments prior to the latest N4G survey.
  - ii. If missing for all previous years, then the assessment is performed on an annual vs cumulative comparison: A4 is compared to B1. This is assessed as ‘on course’ if B1 is greater than or within 0.5% of A4, and ‘off course’ if not. If the funding period end date has passed, the same approach is taken, but the GNR denotes in the basis for assessment field if this has been achieved outside the original funding period.
  - iii. If missing for any of the prior years, but the sum of all available prior years is greater than or within 0.5% of A2, then the assessment is ‘reached commitment’ (further denoting whether reached outside the funding period).
  - iv. If missing for any of the prior years, but the sum of all available prior years is less than A2 (and beyond the 0.5% threshold), A4 is compared to each available year (prior and latest). If for at least half of all available years (each assessed separately) this is within 0.5% or greater of A4 then the whole assessment is ‘on course’. ‘Off course’ is when less than half of the available years meet this criteria.
- 4. Amount of previous total financial disbursements, sum (earliest available 2014–2018)**
  - i. Same principles as above, but for disbursements.
- 5. Cumulative ‘actual’ amount of total financial commitments, for the progress period**
  - i. The sum of all reported total financial commitments to date (B1 and B3).
- 6. Cumulative ‘actual’ amount of total financial disbursements, for the progress period**
  - i. The sum of all reported total financial disbursements to date (B2 and B4).

### **Progress assessment**

To perform the progress assessment, the cumulative ‘expected’ amount of total financial commitments to date (A6) is compared against the cumulative ‘actual’ amount of total financial declarations to date (B5 if commitments, B6 if disbursements). An exception has been noted above when the assessment is based on an annual comparison (B3, B4).

The progress assessment can be classified as:

<b>1. REACHED</b>	
a. If commitment:	when B5 is greater than or within 0.5%* of A2
b. If disbursement:	when B6 is greater than or within 0.5% of A2
Further denoting on the ‘basis for assessment section’ if reached outside the specified funding period. *The sensitivity of this threshold is assessed on an annual basis.	
<b>2. ON COURSE</b>	
a. If commitment:	when B5 is greater than or within 0.5% of A6
b. If disbursement:	when B6 is greater than or within 0.5% of A6
<b>3. OFF COURSE</b>	
a. If commitment:	when B5 is less than A6 (and not on course)
b. If disbursement:	when B6 is less than A6 (and not on course)
<b>4. NOT CLEAR</b>	
a. If the submitted information for B1–B4 is not non-numeric, or is financial information that is not nutrition-related.	
<b>5. NO RESPONSE</b>	
a. If the stakeholder has not partaken in the survey, and therefore there is no information available in any form for B1–B4.	

### **Donor: Non-financial commitments**

Donors also make non-financial commitments that are less specific and more open-ended than financial ones. As such the assessment is dependent on the level of detail provided by the respondents. These assessments, and indeed all, are assessed independently by multiple GNR assessors, and discrepancies resolved through mutual discussion.

## ***Ingredients***

For the 2021 N4G cycle, respondents are asked to provide data from 1 June 2020–31 May 2021.

The following ingredients are derived to perform a progress assessment, including reasoned assumptions and actions when these are unspecified or unclear:

### **C. Original commitment (from Compact)**

#### **1. A measurable target**

- i. The goal of the commitment is a target that can be measured. These can be based on a continuous variable (e.g. value) or have a broader wording that reflects a binary variable that can be measured.
  1. Example of continuous variables:  
France, 2013 non-financial: “France puts emphasis on nutrition programs in the framework of its food assistance (up to 50% of the allocated amount).” In this case, the measurable target is the percentage of the food assistance budget allocated to nutrition programs, hence it can be assessed as a continuous variable.
  2. Example of binary variables:  
Benin, 2013 policy: “Develop a strategy for resource mobilization to implement the new national plan (Panar)”. In this case the measurable target is whether Benin has developed this strategy or not, hence it can be described as binary.
- ii. If missing, the commitment is ‘not assessable’.

#### **2. Commitment period (start and end date)**

- i. The period over which the commitment will take place, based on:
  1. The exact period start and end date as reported. If calendar months were not provided, then the start date is assumed as the 1st of the month following the summit at which the commitment was made. The London 2013 summit took place in June, and so the start date is assumed to be 1 July 2013. For commitments made outside of summits, the start date is assumed to be 1 January of the reported start year. The end date is assumed as 31 December of the reported end year. Years are converted to calendar months by dividing by 12.
  2. The overall period as reported (e.g. BMGF, 2013 non-financial: “over the next 5 years”). Here, the start date is assumed to be

- 1 July 2013. The end date is assumed to be 31 December 2017 based on the number of years specified.
- ii. As mentioned above, if the start date is missing it is assumed to be the month following the relevant summit. In the case of commitments made outside of the summits, the respondent is asked to provide the start date. However, there are currently no cases of this.
  - iii. If the end date is missing, the commitment is assumed to be ongoing.

***Additional ingredients specific to continuous variables (from Compact)***

**3. A baseline**

- i. For the same indicator used to measure progress, the baseline is the value of the measurable target/indicator at the start date.
- ii. If missing but the reported progress shows that the target has been met (or is being met, in the case of an ongoing commitment), then the commitment is 'reached' (or 'on course' for an ongoing commitment). If missing and the reported progress shows insufficient evidence against the measurable target that the commitment has been met, the commitment is 'not assessable'.
  1. For instance, for France's 2013 non-financial commitment, it would be necessary to know the percentage of the budget allocated to nutrition in 2013, to be able to assess whether the latest progress represents an improvement on this. In practice, France's reported progress reads "France continues to allocate each year half of its food assistance budget to nutrition programs". This shows that they are continuing to meet the measurable target of their commitment (as it is an ongoing commitment) and so they are assessed as 'on course'.

**4. Targeted change (difference) in the measurable target**

- i. The target (C1) minus the baseline (C3), in absolute values. This gives the gap that the stakeholder must bridge throughout the commitment period, i.e., the targeted change. The difference also accounts for the direction of the intended change (decrease or increase).

**5. Progress period, to date**

- i. Number of years between the commitment period start date (C2) and the survey date (taken as 2021 for this year's survey). Calendar months are converted to years by dividing by 12.

- ii. When the commitment end date has already passed, the progress period is the same as the commitment period (C2), clearly denoting this in the field for assessment.

**6. 'Expected' progress, annual (or monthly, where applicable)**

- i. The targeted change (C4) divided by the number of years (or months, where applicable) in the commitment period (C2), assuming linearity.

**7. 'Expected' progress to date**

- i. The expected progress on an annual (or monthly) basis (C6), multiplied by the progress period (C5). This estimates the progress that 'should' have taken place by this stage, assuming a linear change.

**D. Data on progress (from N4G surveys)**

**1. Latest progress on the measurable target, 1 June 2020–31 May 2021 (12 months)**

- i. This represents the 'actual' progress to date.
- ii. The reported progress on the specific measurable target
  - 1. Using the above examples, France's commitment to allocate 50% of its food assistance budget to nutrition programs, the information needed to measure this is the percentage of this budget dedicated to nutrition. The information received from the survey should relate to this.
  - 2. The information needed to measure progress against Benin's commitment to "develop a strategy" is whether a strategy was developed or not. Information should therefore relate to this.
- iii. If missing, the assessment is performed using data from the 2019 N4G survey, assuming no further change.
- iv. If missing for both the 2021 and 2020 N4G surveys, the commitment is 'not assessable'.

**2. Previous progress on the measurable target, 1 June 2020–31 May 2021 (12 months)**

- i. In cases where a commitment has been assessed as 'reached' in previous N4G surveys, these are automatically assessed as 'reached' for the 2021 N4G survey. This is because once a stakeholder has reached a commitment, they have fulfilled the requirements on that commitment and achieved their goal. This result is therefore carried forward to reflect the fact that the commitment has already been fulfilled. If the commitment has been reached outside the original commitment period, then this is assessed as 'reached' but it is noted in the basis for assessment field that this was done outside of the original period.

- ii. In these cases, the respondent is still asked to provide information related to the commitment, to highlight the work that they are still doing in the area of their commitment. This information is published in the reported progress field, but does not feature as part of the assessment.
- iii. In all other cases, where the commitment has not already been reached, the latest data (D1) is always prioritised. Where this data is not assessable (the reported information does not relate to the measurable target of the commitment), historic data from the 2020 N4G survey is used.

### ***Progress assessment***

The progress assessment can be classified as:

#### **1. REACHED**

a. If reached in a previous N4G survey, and no contradictory information has been received in subsequent years as specified above.

b. Continuous variable:

If the progress reported in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) is greater than or within 0.1% of the continuous target in C1.

c. Binary variable:

If the progress reported in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) states (or can be directly inferred) that the target has been fully met.

Further denoting on the 'basis for assessment section' if reached outside the specified commitment period.

#### **2. ON COURSE**

a. Continuous variable:

i. Commitment has a defined end date: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) is greater than or within 0.1% of the 'expected' progress to date (C7)

ii. Commitment is assumed to be ongoing: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) is greater than or within 0.1% of the baseline (C3). This is because with no end date, any progress is considered 'on course', no matter how small.

b. Binary variable:

i. Commitment has a defined end date: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) shows sufficient evidence that these goals can be met by the end date in C2.

ii. Commitment is assumed to be ongoing: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measured goals as set out in C1, and (b) shows sufficient evidence that these goals are being met.

### 3. OFF COURSE

#### a. Continuous variable:

- i. Commitment has a defined end date: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) is less than the 'expected' progress to date (C7) (and beyond the 0.1% threshold).
- ii. Commitment is assumed to be ongoing: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measurable target as set out in C1, and (b) is less than the baseline (C3) (and beyond the 0.1% threshold).

#### b. Binary variable:

- i. Commitment has a defined end date: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measured goals as set out in C1, and (b) shows insufficient evidence that these goals can be met by the end date in C2.
- ii. Commitment is assumed to be ongoing: If the reported progress in D1 both (a) relates to the measured goals as set out in C1, and (b) shows insufficient evidence that these goals are being met.

### NOT CLEAR

- a. If the reported progress in D1 does not relate to the measurable target as set out in C1.

### 5. NO RESPONSE

- a. If there is no reported progress in D1 as part of the 2021 N4G survey and the commitment was not assessed as reached from prior N4G surveys.

## Business constituency

At the 2013 summit, stakeholders in the business constituency committed “to putting good nutrition at the core of business practice”. The full commitment from the constituency continues: “As a first step, we will support the productivity and health of our workforces by introducing a nutrition policy and improving policies for maternal health, including support for breastfeeding mothers. Some businesses will also take further steps by improving the nutrition delivered by food systems so that mothers and children have access to the affordable, nutritious foods they need. We will also look to initiatives, such as the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Business Network, as a platform to help facilitate accountable, transparent business engagement to improve nutrition”.

### Business: Workforce

Businesses made commitments to improve the nutritional status of their employees, which included commitments to a nutrition policy for a productive/healthy workforce and a maternal health/breastfeeding policy.



## ***Ingredients***

For the 2021 N4G cycle, respondents are asked to provide data from 1 June 2020–31 May 2021.

The following ingredients are derived to perform a progress assessment, including reasoned assumptions and actions when these are unspecified or unclear:

### **E. Original commitment (from Compact)**

- 1. Commitment for a nutrition policy for a productive/healthy workforce**
  - i. This shows binary information (yes/no) on whether the business has committed to nutrition policy for a productive/healthy workforce.
- 2. Targeted number of employees, nutrition policy for productive/healthy workforce**
  - i. The specific number of targeted employees to be covered by the policy, in the reported level of accuracy.
  - ii. This information is additional to the commitment. Therefore, the commitment is still valid if this information is missing.
- 3. Commitment for a maternal health/breastfeeding policy**
  - i. This shows binary information (yes/no) on whether the business has committed to maternal health/breastfeeding policy or not.
- 4. Targeted number of employees, maternal health/breastfeeding policy**
  - i. The specific number of targeted employees to be covered by the policy, in the reported level of accuracy.
  - ii. This information is additional to the commitment. Therefore, the commitment is still valid if this information is missing.

### **F. Data on progress (from N4G surveys)**

- 1. Latest progress on nutrition policy for a productive/healthy workforce, 1 June 2020–31 May 2021**
  - i. Respondents self-assess their progress based on a five-point ordinal scale:
    1. Little or no progress
    2. Some progress
    3. Final development stage
    4. Partial rollout
    5. Fully implemented
- 2. Number of employees covered by the nutrition policy for a productive/healthy workforce, 1 June 2020–31 May 2021**

- i. The exact number of employees that are covered by the policy during the period 1 June 2020–31 May 2021. If the reported accuracy does not match the one of the original Compact, then it is converted to match it.

**3. Latest progress on maternal health/breastfeeding policy, 1 June 2020–31 May 2021**

- i. Respondents self-assess their progress based on a five-point ordinal scale, as above (F1).

**4. Number of employees covered by the maternal health/breastfeeding policy, 1 June 2020–31 May 2021**

- i. The exact number of employees that are covered by the policy during the period 1 June 2020–31 May 2021. If the reported accuracy does not match the one of the original Compact, then it is converted to match it.

***Progress assessment***

The progress assessment for both the nutrition policy for productive/healthy workforce and maternal health/breastfeeding policy follow the same process.

The progress assessment for the **nutrition policy for productive/healthy workforce** can be classified as:

**1. REACHED COMMITMENT**

- a. If reached in a previous N4G survey, and no contradictory information has been received in subsequent years as specified above.
- b. If the targeted number of employees is specified:
  - when F1 is indicated as ‘fully implemented’ **and** F2 is greater than or within 0.1% of E2.
- c. If the targeted number of employees is not specified:
  - when F1 is marked as ‘fully implemented’.
  - any information supplied for F2 is still published in the ‘reported progress’ filed, but this is not used for the assessment.

Further denoting on the ‘basis for assessment section’ if reached outside the specified commitment period.

**2. ON COURSE**

- a. If the targeted number of employees is specified:
  - when F1 is indicated as ‘fully implemented’ **and** F2 less than E2 (beyond the 0.1% threshold).
  - when F1 is indicated as ‘some progress’, ‘final development stage’ or ‘partial rollout’, irrespective of the relationship between F2 and E2 (even if greater, the policy still has not reached the targeted population).
- b. If the targeted number of employees is not specified:

- when F1 is indicated as 'some progress', 'final development stage' or 'partial rollout'.
- any information supplied for F2 is still published in the 'reported progress' filed, but this is not used for the assessment.

### 3. OFF COURSE

- If the targeted number of employees is specified:
  - when F1 is indicated as 'little or no progress'.
  - any information supplied for F2 is still published in the 'reported progress' filed, but this is not used for the assessment.
- If the targeted number of employees is not specified:
  - when F1 is indicated as 'little or no progress'.
  - any information supplied for F2 is still published in the 'reported progress' filed, but this is not used for the assessment.

### 4. NOT CLEAR

- If the information provided for F1 is not an option on the five-point scale.

### 5. NO RESPONSE

- If there is no reported progress for F1 as part of the 2021 N4G survey, and the commitment was not assessed as reached from prior N4G surveys.

The progress assessment for the **maternal health/breastfeeding policy** can be classified the same as above, replacing:

- E2 for E4
- F1 for F3
- F2 for F4.

## Business: Non-workforce

In addition to details on their workforce commitments, respondents from the business constituency are asked to provide the latest progress on any non-workforce commitments that they have made. Much like the donor non-financial commitments, the assessment is dependent on the level of detail provided by the respondents, and results are assessed independently by different GNR assessors and discrepancies resolved through mutual discussion.

The ingredients and assessment follow the same approach as the donor non-financial commitments, with only one difference:

- Some commitments based on continuous variables represent new activities, and so the baseline (C3) is taken as zero. For instance,

Ajinomoto's 2013 non-workforce reads "2015–2017: Nutrition improvement of 200,000 weaning children, 100,000 pregnant and lactating mothers, and 250,000 school-age children, through Koko Plus supplement (Ghana Nutrition Improvement Project)". This is a measurable and continuous variable, which began from a starting point of zero. This particular example would be subject to the aforementioned processes regarding an achievement with an expired end date.

## **CSO constituency**

CSOs have the same commitment types as donors: financial and non-financial. The full commitment of this constituency reads as follows: "Civil society specifically commits to mobilise private resources to support the scale-up of nutrition programmes, particularly in fragile states, and to coordinate actions to help ensure harmonised and aligned responses to undernutrition. We will also advocate for and help strengthen the transparency of information to allow citizens to hold their governments to account for their commitments and to drive forward action and progress on nutrition."

### **CSO: Financial**

Follows the same approach as donor financial.

### **CSO: Non-financial**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial.

## **Country constituency**

Country governments made the following commitment at the inaugural N4G summit in 2013: "Governments addressing undernutrition specifically commit to provide strong national leadership to strengthen and develop high quality, validated, costed national nutrition plans and mobilise domestic resources for them. We will scale up the implementation of evidence based, cost effective solutions, which significantly impact undernutrition, and we will adapt programmes that are sensitive to the determinants of poor nutrition and encourage the achievement of better nutrition outcomes – across all development sectors." Countries made four types of commitment: impact, financial, policy and program.

### **Country: Impact**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial (continuous variable), with two differences:

- The end date (C2) is assumed to be 2020.
- The latest progress (D1) is often reported using the most up-to-date survey data available, which will likely occur earlier than the reporting period of 1 June 2020–31 May 2021. The progress period (C5) is therefore defined as the number of years (or months, if applicable) between the commitment date (C2) and the year of the latest survey data quoted in the reported progress (D1).

### **Country: Financial**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial. Country financial commitments do not follow the same approach as donor or CSO financial. These country commitments may be based on binary or continuous variables. The comparison to the non-financial assessment approach is therefore more appropriate.

### **Country: Policy**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial.

### **Country: Program**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial.

## **UN agency constituency**

UN agencies did not make a commitment as a constituency at the 2013 summit, and do not have any subcategories for their commitment types. These are therefore referred to simply as 'UN agency commitments'.

### **UN agency: Commitment**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial.

## **'Other' constituency**

The current constituency definition does not include all the organisations that made N4G commitments. Namely, Grand Challenges Canada, the Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, and the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition do not fit into these categories. Therefore, for the time being these are simply presented as 'other' organisations. Like UN agencies, there are no subcategories for commitment types here, and so these are similarly referred to as 'other commitments'.

### **‘Other’: Commitment**

Follows the same approach as donor non-financial.

## Multiple commitments as one

Some commitments have multiple commitment components (such as items in a bullet point list). In these cases, each element is judged separately, and found to be either 'off course', 'on course', or 'reached commitment'. These individual results are then aggregated up to the commitment level, giving the following permutations:

- In cases where at least half of the individual components are 'on course' or 'reached commitment', the commitment is judged as 'on course'.
- If more than half of the individual components are 'off course', then this result is applied to the whole commitment.
- If all individual components are 'reached commitment' then this result is applied to the whole commitment.
- If at least half of the individual components are 'no response', then the commitment is assessed as 'not clear'.

# Analysis methodology for the 2021 Global Nutrition Report

## Standardisation of commitments for progress reporting

In the [2021 Global Nutrition Report: The state of global nutrition](#), we analysed progress by stakeholders by commitment and constituency type in 2020 with preliminary reports of progress in 2021 for commitments made at the N4G 2013 and 2017 summits.

While commitments are made in one of several categories by different stakeholders (e.g., countries make impact, policy, programme or financial commitments), many commitments had multiple commitment components (e.g., two goals within one commitment).

Given this unique situation, in the 2020 and 2021 analysis of progress, it was deemed necessary to disaggregate some commitments. This was to ensure a standardised approach moving forward for comparing commitments but also to provide an opportunity to compare progress made over time using longitudinal methods. We also wanted to ensure comparability across and within stakeholder groups, so undertook a standardisation which involved disaggregation of those commitments that had multiple components into unique commitment goals. Another reason for disaggregating the multiple commitments was to have an accurate analysis of alignment of commitments to the global nutrition targets.

An intensive review of each commitment was undertaken. Those commitments that had multiple components that were distinct were disaggregated into their own individual rows. For instance, if a country impact commitment targeted reduction in stunting, wasting and anaemia, these were disaggregated into three unique commitment goals.

No change was made to the progress assessment for those commitments that were disaggregated into unique commitment goals. As noted in [Chapter 4 of the 2021 Global Nutrition Report](#), these unique commitment goals (also termed individual commitment components) are each assessed on their own merit, and the result of the overall commitment is based on majority of these goals (components) being on course or not.



As of 2020, the N4G Tracker had documented 391 commitments of which 357 were made at the N4G Summit in 2013 and 34 in the N4G Summit in 2017. Disaggregated by unique commitment goals, there was a total of 481 unique commitment goals.

In the process of review, it was also determined that 27 commitment goals were made outside of the two summits and thus were excluded from the analysis. This left us with a sample size of 456 unique commitment goals made at the 2013 N4G and the 2017 Global Nutrition Summit. Of these, 416 unique commitment goals were made at the 2013 N4G Summit and 40 were made at the 2017 Global Nutrition Summit.

73 goals have been consistently coded as “not applicable” across all the progress assessments. (For [Chapter 4 of the 2021 Global Nutrition Report](#), these were excluded, leaving us with a sample size of 383 unique commitment goals for the 2020 assessment). As per discussions with the progress assessment team, these 73 commitments are not tracked and are always coded as not applicable. Some of these are commitments listed under businesses that were not required to make commitments, while some are country and donor commitments that are endorsements and not active commitments thus cannot be tracked.

The disaggregation to standardise commitment goals across stakeholders was conducted in Excel while the descriptive analysis was conducted in STATA 17 SE.

Following the standardisation of commitment goals, we merged the datasets for the 2020 and 2021 progress assessments and determined which goals had been met by or prior to 2020 and which had been met in 2021 itself. Of the 55 commitment goals that had been reported as reached, 48 had been reached by or prior to 2020 while 7 had been reached in 2021.

At the time of analysis for [Chapter 4 of the 2021 Global Nutrition Report](#) (August 2021) not all the 2021 survey data was available, with reporting and progress assessment being available for 278 of the 456 unique commitment goals (55 reached, 134 on course, 26 off course, 62 no response, and one not assessable commitment goal) being reported on.

# Thematic analysis of alignment to global nutrition targets

A thematic analysis was conducted to assess the alignment of the commitment goals to the global nutrition targets. All coding and descriptive frequency computations were conducted in Excel.

Goals were considered to have a broad alignment to the global nutrition targets if any reference was made to the targets. Each commitment goal was reviewed and assigned to the following codes: reduction of stunting, reduction of anaemia, reduction of low birth weight, prevention of increase in childhood obesity, supporting optimal MIYCN (maternal, infant and young child nutrition), reduction in wasting, reduction in salt/sodium intake, halt in rise of diabetes and obesity.

Any goals that were not aligned to the targets were coded as general nutrition commitment goals.

# Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> A stakeholder is defined as an organisation or body that has made an N4G commitment.

<sup>2</sup> Global Nutrition for Growth Compact. 2013. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/248760/Endorserscompact\\_update7\\_10\\_2013.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/248760/Endorserscompact_update7_10_2013.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Nutrition for Growth. 2013. Available at: <https://nutritionforgrowth.org/resource-category/summit-2013/>