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About the Series

The government of Senegal, through the Cellule de Lutte contre la Malnutrition (Nutrition Coordination Unit) (CLM) in the Prime Minister’s Office is embarking on the development of a new Plan Stratégique Multisectoriel de Nutrition (Multisectoral Strategic Nutrition Plan) (PSMN), which will have two broad focus areas: (1) expanding and improving nutrition services; and (2) a reform agenda for the sector. The reform agenda will include policy reorientation, governance, and financing of the PSMN. The PSMN will discuss the framework and timeline for the development of a nutrition financing strategy, which will require specific analysis of the sector spending and financial basis, linking it to the coverage and quality of nutrition services.

Senegal is known for having one of the most effective and far-reaching nutrition service delivery systems in Africa. Chronic malnutrition has dropped to less than 20 percent, one of the lowest in continental Sub-Saharan Africa. Government ownership of the nutrition program has grown from US$0.3 million a year in 2002 to US$5.7 million a year in 2015, increasing from approximately 0.02 percent to 0.12 percent of the national budget. Yet, these developments have not led to enhanced visibility of nutrition-sensitive interventions in relevant sectors such as agriculture, education, water and sanitation, social protection, and health. The absence of nutrition-sensitive interventions in the relevant sectors, combined with the recent series of external shocks, has favored continued fragmentation of approaches, discourse, and interventions that address nutrition. In addition, there is no overall framework for investment decision making around nutrition, which puts achievements made to date in jeopardy. Meanwhile, nutrition indicators are stagnating and other issues with major implications (such as low birth weight, iron deficiency anemia, maternal undernutrition, and acute malnutrition) have received little or no attention.

A review of policy effectiveness can help raise the importance of these issues, including household and community resilience to food and nutrition insecurity shocks, as a new priority in nutrition policy development. This series of analytical and advisory activities, collectively entitled Analysis & Perspective: 15 Years of Experience in the Development of Nutrition Policy in Senegal (“the series”), aims to support the government of Senegal in providing policy and strategic leadership for nutrition. Further, the series will inform an investment case for nutrition (The Case for Investment in Nutrition in Senegal) that will: (1) rationalize the use of resources for cost-effective interventions; (2) mobilize actors and resources; (3) strengthen the visibility of nutrition interventions in different sectors; and (4) favor synergy of interventions and investments.

The series was produced with guidance from a task force of development partner organizations under the leadership of the World Bank, and in close collaboration with the CLM. The task force comprised representatives from the following organizations: Government of Canada, REACH, UNICEF and the World Bank.
### Documents in the series:

| Report                                      | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nutrition Situation in Senegal              |
| *Marc Nene*                                 | An analysis of the nutritional status of key demographic groups in Senegal, including the geographic and sociodemographic inequalities in nutrition outcomes and their determinants. |
| Evolution of Nutrition Policy in Senegal    |
| *Andrea L. Spray*                           | An historical analysis of the nutrition policy landscape in Senegal, including the evolution of nutrition policies and institutions and their respective implications for programming and prioritization of interventions.               |
| Political Economy of Nutrition Policy in Senegal |
| *Ashley M. Fox*                             | An analysis of the policy and political levers that can be used in Senegal to foster government leadership and galvanize the intersectoral coordination needed to mainstream nutrition into government policies and programs, and effectively, efficiently, and sustainably deliver nutrition interventions. |
| Nutrition Financing in Senegal              |
| *Marie-Jeanne Offosse N.*                   | An analysis of the allocated funding to nutrition interventions in Senegal from 2016 to 2019, estimates of budgetary capacity for financing nutrition by government, and estimated costs for selected high-impact interventions. |
| Capacities of the Nutrition Sector in Senegal |
| *Gabriel Deussom N.*, *Victoria Wise*, *Marie Solange Ndione*, *Aida Gadiaga* | An analysis of the organizational and institutional capacities for addressing nutrition in Senegal, covering the CLM, key ministries, and other stakeholders contributing to improvements in nutrition at the central, regional, and local levels. |
| Cost and Benefits of Scaling Up Nutrition Interventions in Senegal |
| *Christian Yao*                             | Analysis of the relative costs and effectiveness of alternative scenarios for scaling up nutrition interventions in Senegal over the five years covering the PSMN. |
| Risks for Scaling Up Nutrition in Senegal   |
| *Babacar Ba*                                | Analysis of the potential risks to the scale-up of nutrition in Senegal, their likelihood of occurrence, potential impact, and potential mitigation measures.                                                       |
| A Decade of World Bank Support to Senegal’s Nutrition Program |
| *Denise Vaillancourt*                       | The World Bank Independent Evaluation Group Project Performance Assessment Report, which evaluates the extent to which World Bank operations supporting nutrition in Senegal from 2002–14 achieved their intended outcomes and draws lessons to inform future investments. |
| Acronym | English | Acronym | Français |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| ADEPME  | Agency for the Development and Guidance of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises | ADEPME  | Agence de Développement et d’Encadrement des Petites et Moyennes Entreprises |
| ANIDA   | National Agency for Integration and Agricultural Development | ANIDA   | Agence Nationale d’Insertion et de Développement Agricole |
| ANPECTP | National Agency of Early Childhood Development and Reception Center | ANPECTP | Agence Nationale de la Petite Enfance et de la Case des Tout-Petits |
| APIX    | National Agency for Investment Promotion and Major Projects | APIX    | Agence Nationale Chargée de la Promotion des Investissements et des Grands Travaux |
| BACDI   | Program Support Unit to the Development Program of the Embassy of Canada to Senegal | BACDI   | Bureau d’Appui à Section Coopération de l’Ambassade du Canada au Sénégal |
| BEN     | National Executive Bureau | BEN     | Bureau Exécutif National |
| CL      | Nutrition Coordination Unit | CL      | Cellule de Lutte contre la Malnutrition |
| CNSA    | National Food Security Council | CNSA    | Conseil National sur la Sécurité Alimentaire |
| CL      | Local government collectives | CL      | Collectivités locales |
| DPPD    | Multiannual Expenditure Planning Document | DPPD    | Document de Programmation Pluriannuelle des Dépenses |
| FAO     | United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization | FAO     | Organisation des Nations Unies pour l’Alimentation et l’Agriculture |
| IFIS    | Integrated Financial Information System | SIGIF   | Système Intégré de Gestion de l’Information Financière |
| ISO     | International Organization for Standardization | ISO     | Organisation Internationale de Normalisation |
| MAER    | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment | MAER    | Ministère de l’Agriculture et de l’Équipement Rural |
| MDG     | Millennium Development Goals | OMD     | Objectifs du Millénaire pour le Développement |
| MEFP    | Ministry of Finance, the Economy and Planning | MEFP    | Ministère de l’Économie, des Finances et du Plan |
| Acronym | English | Acronym | Français |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| MEPA    | Ministry of Livestock and Animal Husbandry | MEPA | Ministère de l'Élevage et des Productions Animales |
| MFFE    | Ministry of Women's Empowerment, Family, and Child Development | MFFE | Ministère de la Femme, de la Famille et de l’Enfance |
| MSAS    | Ministry of Health and Social Affairs | MSAS | Ministère de la Santé et de l’Action Sociale |
| ODA     | Official Development Assistance | APD | Aide Publique au Développement |
| OECD    | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development | OCDE | Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques |
| PNDN    | National Policy for the Development of Nutrition | PNDN | Politique Nationale de Développement de la Nutrition |
| PRN     | Nutrition Enhancement Program | PRN | Programme de Renforcement de la Nutrition |
| PSE     | Emerging Senegal Plan | PSE | Plan Sénégal Émergent |
| PSMN    | Multisectoral Strategic Nutrition Plan | PSMN | Plan Stratégique Multisectoriel de la Nutrition |
| REACH   | Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger and undernutrition | REACH | Efforts Renouvelés contre la Faim et la Sous-Alimentation |
| SAP     | Sectoral Action Plan | PAS | Plan d’Actions Sectoriel |
| SDG     | Sustainable Development Goals | ODD | Objectifs de Développement Durable |
| SUN     | Scaling Up Nutrition Movement | SUN | Mouvement pour le Renforcement de la Nutrition |
| SYSCOA  | West African Accounting System | SYSCOA | Système Comptable Ouest-Africain |
| TFP     | Technical and Financial Partner | PTF | Partenaire Technique et Financier |
| UEMOA   | West African Economic and Monetary Union | UEMOA | Union Économique et Monétaire Ouest-Africaine |
| UNICEF  | United Nations Children’s Fund | UNICEF | Fonds des Nations Unies pour l’Enfance |
| USAID   | United States Agency for International Development | USAID | Agence des États-Unis pour le Développement International |
| WFP     | World Food Programme | PAM | Programme Alimentaire Mondial |
| WHO     | World Health Organization | OMS | Organisation Mondiale de la Santé |

Unless otherwise indicated, child nutrition indicators referenced in this report are taken from the UNICEF-WHO-World Bank Joint Child Malnutrition Estimates.¹
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The government of Senegal, through the Cellule de Lutte contre la Malnutrition (Nutrition Coordination Unit) (CLM) in the Prime Minister’s office, has launched a new Politique National de Développement de la Nutrition (National Policy for the Development of Nutrition) (PNDN)\(^2\) and is embarking on the development of a Plan Stratégique Multisectoriel de la Nutrition (Multisectoral Strategic Nutrition Plan) (PSMN). Risk analysis is vital for the implementation of the PSMN to ensure compliance with the principles of effectiveness and efficiency. Risk analysis also helps to ensure transparent and accurate communication with stakeholders, define responsibilities, promote a proactive attitude in the management of priorities, and facilitate a favorable allocation of resources. The World Bank supports the government of Senegal in the analysis of risks associated with the implementation of the PSMN to promote this proactive measure and improve the conditions for the PSMN’s success.

**Objective**

The objectives of this report are to identify potential risks associated with the implementation of the PSMN by category; their probability of occurrence; the effects they may have on Senegal’s capacity to achieve the strategic nutrition goals; and to propose measures to mitigate the impact of these risks.

**Methodological Approach**

The risk analysis was based on reports of the series, *Analysis & Perspective: 15 Years of Experience in the Development of Nutrition Policy in Senegal*; the PSMN; and abundant documentation on Senegal’s strategic planning, the evolution of public finance procedures, institutional organizations, and administrative reforms. The experiences of international organizations in the field of nutrition policy, as well as those of other countries that have adopted multisectoral nutrition strategies, were also used to inform the analysis.

The methodology used for analysis and management of risks is based on the ISO 31000:2009 Standard of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (ISO 2009a). The risk for an organization is defined as “the effect of uncertainty on the achievement of objectives.”

In addition to the analyses and recommendations in the reports of the *Analysis & Perspective: 15 Years*...
of Experience in the Development of Nutrition Policy in Senegal series, the following three sources were used to gather information for the risk analysis: (1) one-on-one interviews, (2) a survey questionnaire administered to sectoral ministries, and (3) benchmarks derived from several sources.

PSMN Implementation Context

The circumstances listed below are key aspects of the PSMN implementation context:

- **Strengthened international commitment to nutrition:** Currently, the international environment is very favorable to nutrition policies. Several initiatives are underway that demonstrate strong awareness among global stakeholders of nutrition issues and that create partnership opportunities for supporting the implementation of the PSMN.

- **Stagnating global development assistance:** Even though nutrition policies are receiving a great deal of attention and support at the international level, the financing constraints remain considerable. Trends in official development assistance (ODA) have shown steady growth at an average rate of 4.2 percent since 1997, but also show stabilization of aid levels as a proportion of gross national income. In a context of a moderate increase in overall development aid, allocation of resources in favor of nutrition remains an important challenge for the success of scaling up.

- **Nutrition leadership in Senegal remains unconsolidated:** Senegal has made significant strides in nutrition policy but, despite the progress, several malnutrition issues are still acute. Their persistence calls into question the effectiveness of the Senegalese model and threatens to undermine the confidence and commitment of policy makers, stakeholders, and partners. The new planning phase, with the implementation of the PSMN, must take up the challenge of consolidating the gains that have been achieved and renewing efforts toward major improvement in the population’s nutritional status.

- **Integrated multisectoral approach to nutrition poses challenges for governance:** Implementation of the PSMN poses a major challenge with regard to the successful integration of all sectors relevant to nutrition policy and to the expansion of coverage. The organization and resources of individual ministries will need to be strengthened, and the institutional framework will need to be consolidated and endowed with sufficient authority to coordinate actions at sectoral and local levels.

- **Growing need for nutrition resources:** Budgetary requirements for the implementation of the PSMN will increase substantially from 2017 through 2021, reflecting not only increased integration of nutrition into relevant sectors, but also national scale-up to reach the target of 80 percent population coverage. In addition to the financial needs, effective implementation of the PSMN will require increased availability of human resources with nutrition expertise. Training capacities and facilities will have to adapt to provide the necessary personnel for all nutrition activities, from the most highly specialized to support staff and technicians.

- **Public reforms that affect nutrition governance:** Senegal was the first member country of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) to adopt the 2009 guidelines relating to the new harmonized public finance framework. The objective of these reforms is to improve the efficiency of public spending. Ultimately, the CLM and ministries will have a multiannual planning framework for spending, better visibility of budgeted actions, and an information system that facilitates coordination, monitoring, and accounting of activities.

Risk Mapping and Assessment Principles

Risk classification and detailed analyses are presented according to the following categories:

- Institutional risks (table A.1)
- Risks related to mobilization of financial resources (table A.2)
- Risks related to mobilization of human resources (table A.3)
Risks related to mobilization of other resources (table A.4)
Organizational and operational risks (table A.5)
Risks related to monitoring, evaluation, and control (table A.6)
Risks related to communication and change management (table A.7)
Exceptional risks (table A.8)

Assessment of each specific risk is made according to its level of criticality (Cri), which is a combination of two factors (each rated on a scale of 1 to 3):

- Degree of exposure to the risk (Exp): What is the probability of occurrence of this risk in the implementation phase of the PSMN?
- Impact of this risk (Imp): What would be the severity of the impact if the risk appears?

The level of criticality is rated on a scale of 1 to 9 by the formula:

$$\text{Cri} = \text{Exp} \times \text{Imp}$$

**Summary and Classification of Risks**

The sources of risk were classified into four categories, according to their level of criticality:

- **very high risks**, whose probability and expected impact could potentially cause the PSMN to fail; adequate mitigating measures are needed to ensure reasonable control
- **high risks**, which can have a significant impact on the outcomes of the PSMN; strong monitoring and mitigating measures are needed to improve the conditions for implementation of the PSMN and prospects for achieving its objectives
- **moderate risks**, which require monitoring and measures to improve the conditions for implementation of the PSMN and prospects for achieving its objectives
- **low risks**, whose more limited impact on the conditions for implementation of the PSMN can be tolerated

**Risk Management**

Actions to mitigate risk include:

- **avoiding** them by eliminating the activities at the source of the identified risk (ruled out because the implementation of the PSMN is considered in its entirety)
- **reducing** them through measures to mitigate their likelihood and impact
- **sharing** them by transferring them partly or entirely to third parties through, for example, comanagement or insurance
- **tolerating** them, particularly when their impact is limited or the cost to avoid them is high compared to the expected gains

Ultimately, selection of risk mitigating measures will depend on several factors including the initial level of criticality of the risk, and the feasibility and effectiveness of the recommended measure. Feasibility is rated on a three-tier scale according to complexity and the political, legal, financial, and administrative constraints to implementation, with level 1 being the most difficult to implement and level 3 being the most feasible.

Tables A.1 to A.8 present identified risks by category, their assessed risk of exposure and impact, and initial criticality; the recommended mitigating measures and their estimated feasibility; and the resulting risk of exposure and impact—if recommended mitigating measures are taken—and residual criticality.

**Risk Management System**

Risk management requires an organization and system of governance for regular, timely, and rigorous monitoring to ensure that the risks are controlled and that the monitoring system satisfactorily addresses the risk management objectives. The following actions are recommended:

- Designate a person in charge of risk management at CLM
Conclusion

This risk analysis resulted in several recommended mitigating measures, of which the following are suggested as top priorities:

Institutional risks (table A.1):

- Advocate for strong political commitment in favor of the PSMN and involve leaders at the highest level in its implementation
- Strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively
- Establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system

Risks related to mobilization of financial resources (table A.2):

- Increase the budget lines for nutrition for the CLM and ministries
- Explore the feasibility of creating a nutrition financing fund by taxing products damaging to health
- Organize a donors’ roundtable conference to promote maximum and optimal mobilization of nutrition financing
- Introduce nutrition-related conditionalities in budget support
- Promote more active participation of the local population, associations, and the diaspora in the definition, funding, and implementation of priority actions
- Advocate to industrialists, the food processing industry, and producers to improve the availability of healthy and nutritious food
- Advocate for industrial and agrifood processors and producers to improve the availability of healthy and nutritious food

Risks related to mobilization of human resources (table A.3):

- Make strategic investments in training and research

Organizational and operational risks (table A.5):

- Strengthen multisectoral coordination at the regional and local levels

Risks related to monitoring, evaluation, and control (table A.6):

- Develop and deploy a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan

Risks related to communication and change management (table A.7):

- Develop and implement a communication and advocacy plan for the nutrition sector

Strategic risks related to implementation of the PSMN (table A.8):

- Coordinate management of Strategic risks related to implementation of the PSMN with food security agencies
Introduction

Senegal has one of the most effective and comprehensive nutrition service delivery systems in Africa. Between 1991–92 and 2012–13, chronic malnutrition dropped from 34.4 percent to less than 20 percent. However, this progress has not led to stepped up nutrition-sensitive interventions in relevant sectors such as agriculture, education, water and sanitation, social protection, or health. This absence of nutrition-sensitive interventions, combined with a series of external shocks (economic crises, increased food prices, and irregular rainfall), has resulted in a persistent fragmentation of approaches, discourse, and interventions. As a result, there is no comprehensive framework guiding nutrition investments in Senegal.

In addition, nutritional indicators have stagnated in recent years, while other issues with major implications (such as low birth weight, iron deficiency anemia, maternal undernutrition, and acute malnutrition) have received little or no attention. A review of policy effectiveness can help raise the importance of these issues, in particular household and community resilience to food and nutrition insecurity shocks, as a new priority in the development of nutrition policies. This series of analytical and advisory activities, collectively entitled "Analysis & Perspective: 15 Years of Experience in the Development of Nutrition Policy in Senegal" ("the series"), aims to support the government of Senegal in providing policy and strategic leadership for nutrition. Further, the series will inform the Case for Investment in Nutrition in Senegal (Ruel-Bergeron 2018) that will: (1) rationalize the use of resources for cost-effective interventions; (2) mobilize actors and resources; (3) strengthen the visibility of nutrition interventions in different sectors; and (4) favor synergy of interventions and investments.

The government of Senegal, through the CLM, launched the PNDN in 2015 and is embarking on the development of a new PSMN. Risk analysis is vital for the implementation of the PSMN to ensure compliance with the principles of effectiveness and efficiency. Risk analysis also helps to ensure transparent and accurate communication with stakeholders, define responsibilities, promote a proactive attitude toward the management of priorities, and facilitate allocation of resources. The World Bank supports the government of Senegal in conducting this analysis of the risks associated with implementation of the PSMN to promote a proactive approach and improve the conditions of success of the nutrition strategy.
Objective

The purposes of this report are (1) to identify the potential risks associated with the implementation of the PSMN by category, probability of occurrence, and the effects they may have on Senegal’s capacity to achieve strategic nutrition goals, and (2) to define measures to mitigate the effects of these risks on the achievement of the ambitions set out in the new strategy.

The specific objectives are to:

- Identify and map the institutional, organizational, financial, and operational risks
- Analyze the potential effects of the identified risks on the implementation of the PSMN
- Prioritize the identified risks
- Recommend strategies to mitigate, review, and monitor the identified risks

Methodological Approach

Literature review:

The analysis of risks was based on: the reports of the series; the PSMN; documentation related to Senegal’s strategic planning; and the evolution of public finance procedures, institutional organizations, and administrative reforms. The experiences of international organizations in the field of nutrition policy—and those of other countries that have adopted multisector nutrition strategies—were also used to inform the analysis.

Reference:

The methodology used for risk analysis and management is based on the ISO’s ISO 31000:2009 Standard (ISO 2009). The risk for an organization is defined by the ISO and for the purposes of this report as “the effect of uncertainty on the achievement of objectives.” The risk is symmetrically assessed by comparing negative variations (falling short of targets) with positive variations (opportunities to exceed targets). Although most of the analyses lead to an assessment of risks in negative terms, the missed opportunities will also be taken into account in this report.

As described in the risk management process recommended by the ISO 31000 standard (ISO 2009), the first step consists of analyzing the context in which the PSMN will be implemented to identify the most relevant factors that may influence its success. Establishing the context will facilitate the assessment of opportunities or threats and their strengths and constraints in the short and medium term; this information will be used to identify the types of risks and provide evidence of their significance.

The second step of the risk assessment comprises the following three activities:

- Identifying the various categories of risk by mapping and providing a precise definition of each risk
- An analysis of each risk to weigh its likelihood of occurrence and the magnitude of its potential impact
- An overall risk rating to prioritize and define mechanisms for handling them

The third step of the risk assessment concerns the handling of the identified risks through defining measures to mitigate their impacts.

This approach involves ongoing communication and consultation with stakeholders to gather the information and guidance required for the assessments, and to involve them in the risk management process. It also requires an organization for regular risk monitoring and enhanced responsiveness to the changing context and sources of risk.

Information gathering:

In addition to the analyses and recommendations from the reports in the series, the following three sources were used to gather information:

- Face-to-face interviews with representatives of CLM; Bureau Exécutif National (National Executive Bureau) (BEN); Bureau d’Appui à Section
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Coopération de l’Ambassade du Canada au Sénégal (Program Support Unit to the Development Program of the Embassy of Canada to Senegal) (BACDI); Ministère de la Santé et de l’Action Sociale (Ministry of Health and Social Affairs) (MSAS); Ministère de l’Agriculture et de l’Equipement Rural (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment) (MAER); Ministère de l’Economie, des Finances et du Plan (Ministry of Finance, the Economy and Planning) (MEFP); Ministère de l’Elevage et des Productions Animales (Ministry of Livestock and Animal Husbandry) (MEPA); Efforts Renouvelés contre la Faim et la Sous-Alimentation (Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger and undernutrition) (REACH); Ministère de la Femme, de la Famille et de l’Enfance (Ministry of Women’s Empowerment, Family, and Child Development) (MFFE); Agence Nationale de la Petite Enfance et de la Case des Tout-Petits (National Agency of Early Childhood Development and Reception Center) (ANPECTP); and United States Agency for International Development (USAID)–Yaajeende

• A survey questionnaire for sectoral ministries involved in the development of the PSMN
• Benchmarking using sources such as Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement reports; national nutrition plans of Côte d’Ivoire, Madagascar, and Rwanda; institutional and organizational models of comparable programs in Senegal; and financing models.

Limitations:

Risk analysis is an iterative process that deserves a comprehensive review—in collaboration with stakeholders—to reach a common understanding of the principles and assessments. The innovation of incorporating risk analysis into strategic planning further justifies taking advantage of the opportunity to bring stakeholders together for a thorough review.
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PSMN implementation context

Spray (2018) traces the evolution of nutrition policies in Senegal through several generations and, for each one, six factors of success: nutrition championship, institutional ownership, multisectoral coordination and collaboration, community ownership, integrated services and delivery platforms, and partner engagement. These factors will continue to influence the implementation context of the PSMN. Their evolution will be critical in the risk analysis both for the identification of the principal sources of risk and for the assessment of their impact.

Strengthened International Commitment to Nutrition

The international context is very favorable to nutrition policy. Aware of the considerable social and economic damage caused by malnutrition, the international community has raised nutrition as a development priority. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—particularly Goal 2 to “End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture”—following the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) demonstrate a strong commitment to fight against malnutrition. In April 2016, the United Nations proclaimed 2016–25 as the Decade of Action on Nutrition. The REACH initiative of the United Nations and the SUN Movement contributed to strengthening the capacities of nutrition stakeholders and promoting a multisector approach to advance nutrition policy. In October 2016, the World Bank and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) launched the initiative Investing in the Early Years, which emphasizes better management of child nutrition from conception to age two, the first 1000 days that are critical for a healthy life. These are among the many existing global initiatives showing strong awareness of nutrition issues and opportunities for partnership in support of the implementation of the PSMN.

Stagnating Global Development Assistance

Even though nutrition policies receive great attention and support at the international level, financing constraints are expected to remain strong, particularly in a phase of scaling-up and increasing financial need. Trends in ODA show steady growth at an average rate of 4.2 percent since 1997, but stagnation of aid as a proportion of gross national income. The ratio of aid to gross national income declined from the early 1960s to 2001, reaching a low of 0.21 percent, and then
remained stable at approximately 0.3 percent over the decade from 2005 to 2015. The economic and financial crises in Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) (OECD) countries and weak economic growth account for the low margin of aid growth over this period; in the medium term, however, there are a few indications of a significant increase in ODA. Allocation of resources in favor of nutrition in development priorities, therefore, remains an important challenge for the success of scaling-up nutrition and will require strong commitment from leaders.

Nutrition Leadership in Senegal Remains to be Consolidated

Senegal has garnered significant achievements in nutrition policy. It ranks among the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa with the lowest prevalence of chronic malnutrition. But despite this progress, the country still faces several serious malnutrition issues. Significant disparities exist between regions and, despite its decline in the past ten years, the prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age is still higher than the critical threshold defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) (Nene 2018). The north-south divide in the prevalence of child stunting has persisted throughout the past decade and even intensified in recent years (Nene 2018). The most recent nutrition data indicate a risk of regression in nutrition policy performance in several areas, calling into question the effectiveness of the Senegalese model and threatening to undermine the confidence and commitment of policy makers, stakeholders, and partners. The new planning phase, with the implementation of the PSMN, must take up the challenge of consolidating the gains made and further improving the population’s nutritional status.

Integrated Multisector Approach to Nutrition Poses Implications for Governance

Nutrition policies have evolved from a focus primarily on health to a multisector and integrated approach, involving all sectors and stakeholders relevant to nutrition and taking into account the local causes of malnutrition. The multisector approach to nutrition has long been a reality in Senegal; before 1968, there was already an increased awareness of the importance of multisector coordination in the fight against malnutrition (Spray 2018). The multisectoral approach to nutrition was institutionalized with the creation of the CLM, tasked by its enabling decree with “setting up a framework of dialogue between ministries and entities responsible for nutrition policies, in particular the NGOs and grassroots community organizations” and “in general, develop[ing] an effective synergy with the other poverty reduction programs.” The PSMN, which is part of the operationalization and implementation of the PNDN, was developed on a multisectoral basis with the commitment and involvement of all stakeholders, including sectoral ministries, civil society institutions, the private sector, Collectivités Locales (local government collectives) (CLs) and technical and financial partners (TFPs). Ambitious targets for the reduction of malnutrition have been defined (box 1) and Plans d’Actions Sectoriel (Sectoral Action Plans) (SAPs) prepared accordingly, with investment budgets sharply shifting in favor of nutrition programs.

The effective implementation of the PSMN poses a major challenge to the successful mainstreaming of nutrition policy in all relevant sectors and the expansion of territorial coverage. It involves strengthening the organization and resources of ministries and consolidating the institutional coordination framework with sufficient authority to coordinate actions at the sectoral and local levels.

Growing Need for Nutrition Resources

The total expenditure for nutrition reached US$195 million for the period from 2012 to 2015, that is, about US$49 million per year (Offosse N. 2018). More than half (58 percent) of this funding comes from nutrition-sensitive sectors (Offosse N. 2018). In order to fund the PSMN from 2017 through 2021, budgetary needs for nutrition will increase substantially, reflecting
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The increase in scope of mainstreaming nutrition activities in the sectors, as well as the national scale-up of a set of nutritional activities to achieve the 80 percent population coverage target. Table 1 shows costs estimated by each sector during planning workshops for their respective nutrition action.

In addition to the financial needs, effective implementation of the PSMN will require greater availability of human resources specializing in nutrition, both for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive activities. Despite the existence of opportunities for higher education, there is still a shortage of skilled personnel; the lack of human resources specializing in nutrition is a problem that affects all sectors both at the central and decentralized levels. Training capacity and facilities will need to be adapted to provide the required personnel to all nutrition activities and the most specialized higher qualifications to the support staff and technicians (Deussom et al. 2018).

Public Reforms that Affect Nutrition Governance

Senegal was the first country in the UEMOA to enact the six 2009 regional directives on public finance.

BOX 1: Objectives of the PSMN

The PSMN lays out the following strategic objectives for nutrition by 2025:

- Reduce the prevalence of stunting by at least 45 percent
- Reduce by 30 percent the proportion of children with low birth weight
- Reduce to less than 5 percent the rate of acute malnutrition among children under five
- Increase to at least 50 percent the rate of exclusive breastfeeding
- Reduce by 50 percent the prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age and other vulnerable groups
- Reduce by at least 40 percent the prevalence of other micronutrient deficiencies, such as iodine, zinc, and vitamin A
- Reduce by at least 20 percent the prevalence of obesity among vulnerable groups
- Promote nutrition education, research, and innovation

**TABLE 1: Estimated Costs by Sector and Year for Nutrition in Senegal**

| Sector                              | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Cost per sector |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|
| Agriculture                         | 1.4  | 2.3  | 4.5  | 5.3  | 4.2  | 17.6           |
| Commerce                            | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.5            |
| Education                           | 0.8  | 0.8  | 1.1  | 1.2  | 0.8  | 4.6            |
| Environment                         | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0.6  | 0.6  | 0.6  | 2.8            |
| Fisheries                           | 0.1  | 0.3  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.01 | 0.8            |
| Health                              | 27.8 | 22.4 | 19.2 | 18.2 | 17.5 | 105.2          |
| High-level education and research   | 0.1  | 0.5  | 0.6  | 1.0  | 1.0  | 3.1            |
| Industry                            | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.8            |
| Livestock                           | 1.4  | 4.1  | 1.8  | 1.8  | 1.9  | 11.0           |
| Local government collectives        | 15.3 | 19.1 | 18.8 | 17.4 | 17.9 | 88.5           |
| Social protection                   | 16.2 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.4 | 81.5           |
| Water, sanitation, and hygiene      | 23.0 | 8.4  | 5.8  | 0.7  | 0.8  | 38.7           |
| Total                               |      |      |      |      |      | 355.2          |

*Source: Sectoral workshop results, as per the CLM.*
These reforms are intended to improve the effectiveness of public expenditure, in particular by:

- Developing a program budget and measurement of the performance of public action
- Introducing a multiyear approach in the Documents de Programmation Budgétaire et Economique Pluriannuel (Multiannual Budgetary and Economic Planning Documents) and the Documents de Programmation Pluriannuelle des Dépenses (Multiannual Expenditure Planning Documents) (DPPD)
- Strengthening parliamentary oversight, oversight bodies, and the Court of Auditors
- Introducing rules adapted to the results-based management approach
- Delegating regulatory authority to the Minister of Finance

A Système Intégré de Gestion de l’Information Financière (Integrated Financial Information Management System) (IFIS) will be put in place to ensure the successful implementation of these reforms.

After the effective implementation of reforms and establishment of IFIS, the CLM and ministries will have a multiannual planning framework for their spending, better visibility of budgeted actions, and an information system that facilitates their coordination, monitoring and accounting of activities.
Risk Classification

The implementation of the PSMN entails the coordinated management of activities, projects, and programs within a multisectoral framework in order to achieve the defined strategic objectives. Risk management is important for the success of the implementation process. It is based on a proactive approach, which anticipates implementation constraints by identifying situations and events likely to affect or even jeopardize the achievement of the targeted objectives.

The identified risks to the PSMN are based on a process cycle, beginning with the conditions for preparation of development strategies and quality of implementation planning (table A.1), the mobilization of adequate resources for their implementation, and associated capacities to ensure the proper coordination of stakeholders within the value chain (tables A.2–A.5). To ensure the expected results, the process must be accompanied by communication and change management (table A.7). Above all, the process requires an effective system to monitor, evaluate, and control the implementation activities (table A.6), making it possible to capitalize on lessons learned. Figure 1 outlines the process.

Risk classification and the detailed analyses are presented according to the process shown in figure 1:

- Institutional risks (table A.1)
- Risks related to mobilization of financial resources (table A.2)
- Risks related to mobilization of human resources (table A.3)
- Risks related to mobilization of other resources (table A.4)
- Organizational and operational risks (table A.5)
- Risks related to monitoring, evaluation, and control (table A.6)
- Risks related to communication and change management (table A.7)
- Exceptional risks (table A.8)

Principles of Risk Assessment

Each risk to the PSMN is assessed according to its level of criticality (\(C_{ri}\)), which is a combination of two factors:

- The degree of exposure to the risk (\(Exp\)): What is the likelihood of occurrence of this risk during the PSMN’s implementation phase?
Impact of the risk (Imp): What would be the level of severity of the impact if the risk occurs?

The degree of exposure of the PSMN to the risks—and the consequences in the event of occurrence—are assessed as follows:

**EXPOSURE TO THE RISK (EXP):**

| Assessment (score) | Characteristics                        |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|
| High (3)           | High likelihood of occurrence           |
| Average (2)        | Likely to occur                         |
| Low (1)            | Remote likelihood of occurrence         |

**THE IMPACT OF THE RISK (IMP):**

| Assessment (score) | Characteristics                                                                 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High (3)           | Would cause significant delays or problems in the achievement of most PSMN strategic objectives |
| Average (2)        | Would cause moderate delays or problems in the achievement of numerous PSMN strategic objectives, or more significant problems for a limited number of PSMN strategic objectives |
| Low (1)            | Would not significantly affect achievement of PSMN strategic objectives          |

The choice of a three-level scale—both for the assessment of exposure to risks and the impact of risks—is due to the lack of well-documented risk bases for similar cases, the qualitative nature of the assessments, and the need to focus on major risk classifications. The use of four- to five-level classification systems would increase the number of risk situations without providing additional clarity to the analyses and or their conclusions.

The level of criticality is rated on a scale of 1 to 9 by the formula:

\[ Cri = Exp \times Imp \]

The risks were classified into four categories, according to their level of criticality:

- **very high risks**, whose probability and expected impact could potentially cause the PSMN to fail (level of criticality 9 in table 2, shown in red); adequate mitigating measures are needed to ensure reasonable control
- **high risks**, which can have a significant impact on the outcomes of the PSMN (level of criticality 4 or 6 in table 2, shown in orange); strong monitoring and mitigating measures are needed to improve...
the conditions for implementation of the PSMN and prospects for achieving its objectives

- **moderate risks** (level of criticality 3 in table 2, shown in yellow), which require monitoring and measures to improve the conditions for implementation of the PSMN and prospects for achieving its objectives

- **low risks** (level of criticality 1 or 2 in table 2, shown in green), whose more limited impact on the conditions for implementation of the PSMN can be tolerated

### Principles of Risk Management

Actions to mitigate risk include the following four options:

- **avoiding** them by eliminating the source of the identified risk (ruled out because the implementation of the PSMN is considered in its entirety)

- **reducing** them through measures to mitigate their likelihood and impact

- **sharing** them by transferring them partly or entirely to third parties through, for example, comanagement or insurance

- **tolerating** them, particularly when their impact is limited or the cost to avoid them is high compared to the expected gains

Ultimately, selection of risk mitigating measures will depend on several factors including the initial level of criticality of the risk, and the feasibility and effectiveness of the recommended measure. Feasibility is rated on a three-tier scale according to complexity and the political, legal, financial, and administrative constraints to implementation, with level 1 being the most difficult to implement and level 3 being the most feasible (table 3).

Tables A.1 to A.8 present identified risks by category, their assessed risk of exposure and impact, and initial criticality; the recommended mitigating measures and their estimated feasibility; and the resulting risk of exposure and impact—if recommended mitigating measures are taken—and residual criticality.

### TABLE 2: Scale of Risk Criticality

| Level of criticality | Exposure |
|----------------------|----------|
|                      | Low 1 | Average 2 | High 3 |
| Impact High 3        | 3     | 6         | 9      |
| Average 2            | 2     | 4         | 6      |
| Low 1                | 1     | 2         | 3      |

### TABLE 3: Scale of Risk Mitigation Feasibility

| Feasibility (score) | Characteristics |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Very feasible (3)   | Measures that can be easily implemented, without severe financial, political, legal, or administrative constraints |
| Moderately feasible (2) | Measures that are difficult to implement because of financial, political, legal, or administrative constraints |
| Very difficult (1)  | Measures that are complex and very difficult to implement because of financial, political, legal, or administrative constraints |
Risk Assessment

Institutional Risks

The PSMN is part of a broader framework for economic and social planning at the national and sectoral levels and in compliance with government’s policy commitments. Its effective implementation cannot be guaranteed if the strategy’s development process does not account for the guidance defined in national and sectoral plans. The participatory approach to the development of the PSMN—and the accountability of stakeholders in achieving its strategic objectives—are key factors in evaluating its overall coherence and stakeholders’ understanding of strategic objectives. Alignment with national and sectoral strategies is also an essential component in the justification for the mobilization of state resources for the implementation of programs and is therefore a major risk factor. Beyond the political commitment of leaders, effective implementation of the PSMN requires an appropriate governance framework, with authority, organization, and legal and operational systems that facilitate harmonious management of activities in a results-based approach.

Program success requires, at the start of implementation, an optimal operational design that takes into account the impact of actions, interdependencies, and the availability of resources. Thorough preparation enables a more precise assessment of the feasibility of proposed actions and clarification of the interdependencies and expected effects. It is essential for effective programming and implementation planning and provides the best chance of achieving objectives on deadline and on budget. Poorly managed programming is an inevitable cause of delays, increased risks and, ultimately, inefficient and ineffective implementation.

Five institutional risks have been identified (table A.1):

Weak commitment of political leaders

- Description:
  Lack of political commitment to nutrition, limiting the possibility of: (1) putting the PSMN at the top of government priorities; and (2) creating an institutional framework with a strong leadership to ensure the mobilization of stakeholders and effective implementation.

- Exposure of the PSMN: high (3)
  Lack of political commitment was identified as the main reason for the low priority given by the government to food and nutrition interventions. Nutrition rarely appears in the discourse of leaders; they do
not seem to see nutrition’s visible and concrete political issues. Study participants reported very few references to nutrition in major communications of the President or Prime Minister. The population exerts little political pressure, sounding the alarm only in extreme situations of famine.

- Impact: high (3)
The involvement of policy makers at the highest level is crucial to the mobilization of institutional, human, and financial resources for the timely and effective implementation of the PSMN, particularly for scaling up at the sectoral level and increasing territorial coverage. Weak political support would make it more difficult to implement the necessary institutional reforms, mobilize public resources and TFPs, and ensure coordination between stakeholders at the sectoral and local levels.

- Recommended mitigating measures:
The initial high level of criticality of this risk requires a significant mobilization of stakeholders, under the coordination of the CLM, to ensure better commitment among leaders. The key recommended mitigating measures are: (1) advocate for strong political commitment to the PSMN and involve leaders at the highest level in its implementation (Deussom et al. 2018); (2) enhance the value of the PSMN within the framework of the Plan Sénégal Emergent (Emerging Senegal Plan) (PSE) and Senegal’s SDG commitments for its impact on the levers of emergence (such as human capital, competitiveness, and productivity) and overall economic growth; and (3) build effective coalitions among key stakeholders to promote the cause of nutrition. These recommended mitigating measures involve nutrition stakeholders with no major financial or political constraints; they are easily feasible (3) and would reduce the level of criticality from very high (9) to high (6).

Poor alignment of the PSMN with economic and social priorities

- Description:
Limited visibility of nutrition in Senegal’s economic and social policy framework documents (such as the PSE and SDGs), making it difficult to promote nutrition as a development priority and attract donor funding.

- Impact: high (3)
Government commitment to nutrition is formalized in various national and sectoral policy documents and through the signing of international agreements. The PSE, which is Senegal’s economic and social policy benchmark, includes in its Human Capital, Social Protection and Sustainable Development axis, “Health and Nutrition” as a key lever for “having good human capital.” However, the scope of nutrition objectives seems to be limited to the issue of “improving maternal and child health and nutrition.” It is advisable to enhance the value of the PSMN, beyond its effects on health, by emphasizing its impact on human development, human capital, and competitiveness and to frame nutrition as an important axis of economic development and fulfilment of Senegal’s commitments to the SDGs.

- Recommended mitigating measures:
Placing nutrition at the heart of public policy also implies enhancing the value of the PSMN within the implementation framework of the PSE and Senegal’s SDG commitments for its impact on the levers of emergence (such as human capital, competitiveness, and productivity) and overall economic growth. The PSMN could be linked to the PSE as its nutrition component. This easily feasible mitigating measure (3) would reduce the level of criticality from high (6) to moderate (3).
**Poor alignment of international partners with nutrition policy**

- **Description:**
  Policies of international partners that focus on areas of intervention that are not fully aligned with the objectives defined in the PSMN, do not fund priority actions, or do not cover the most important geographical areas.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** low (1)
  The commitment of TFPs to the planning of nutrition policies has, for a long time, been very strong. Nutrition is high on the agenda of bilateral and multilateral donors, the agencies of the United Nations, and NGOs, which have participated in more than sixty projects in Senegal from 2010 to 2016. In addition to their financial support, TFPs have contributed significantly by providing expertise through their technical assistance. Their decisive contribution to the development of the PSMN reflects TFPs’ ongoing high level of engagement in Senegal’s nutrition policy. However, decreased funding and—depending on the intervention—widely varying coverage rates are constraints, given the context of increasing needs and strengthened multisectoral management. The risk lies primarily in the reduced capacity to meet the needs of scale-up and diversification of interventions. More formal and effective coordination with international partners is required to ensure that interventions are better aligned with the priorities of the nutrition policy.

- **Impact:** high (3)
  Although it is necessary to eventually reduce dependence on international donors, their contributions in the early phases of implementation of the PSMN will be crucial, and a decline in their commitments constitutes a major risk for the success of the PSMN.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  The establishment of (1) a common results framework, including alignment of partner investments with the PSMN; and (2) a framework for regular consultation with TFPs to coordinate interventions and monitor commitments and achievements. These actions, which are included in the SUN Movement commitments, are feasible (3) and would reduce the level of criticality from moderate (3) to low (2).

**Weak institutional framework for nutrition**

- **Description:**
  Institutional anchoring of nutrition in the Prime Minister’s office does not provide the CLM with the authority and necessary resources to effectively coordinate the actions of sectoral ministries and other stakeholders, activities at the regional and local levels, and relations with TFPs.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
  The establishment of the CLM and its attachment to the Prime Minister’s office constitute a step forward in the implementation of a multisectoral approach. The CLM’s mandate is to (1) assist the Prime Minister in the definition and implementation of the national nutrition policy; (2) develop appropriate strategies for the implementation of national nutrition programs and ensure their effective implementation; and (3) monitor and evaluate nutrition policy and programs. Deussom et al. (2018) indicate that 77 percent of stakeholders recognize CLM’s role as the driving force in the nutrition sector in Senegal; the results also underscore the need to expand the mission of the BEN to provide it with means of ensuring effective coordination at the sectoral, regional, and local levels. Rivalries within and between sectors and other organizations in charge of coordinating and implementing nutrition-related initiatives, such as ANPECTP and Conseil National sur la Sécurité Alimentaire (National Food Security Council) (CNSA), can undermine the efficiency and credibility of local actions serving the same beneficiaries. CLM’s role in sectoral coordination will expand with implementation of the PSMN; therefore, it would be appropriate to adapt the institutional framework of the CLM to provide it with more resources to fulfill its mission (such as chairing the CLM, representation of the ministries, carrying out interministerial consultations, and the mandate and resourcing of the BEN).
Because sectoral coordination is an important lever for the effectiveness and efficiency of the nutrition strategy, weak institutional capacity could hamper the CLM’s work and thereby jeopardize the results of its projects and programs. In a context of results-based management, there could also be negative consequences for the resources made available for implementation of the PSMN.

**Recommended mitigating measures:**

To inform efforts to strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively (Deussom et al. 2018), it is recommended to conduct a study to determine the optimal institutional structure, drawing on examples of multisectoral institutions from (1) the nutrition sector in other countries or (2) domains other than nutrition in Senegal. Given the environment of rationalization and reduction of administrative structures, this reform would face political, administrative, and financial constraints and would therefore be difficult to carry out (2); it is necessary, however, and would reduce the level of criticality from high (6) to moderate (3).

**Lack of coherence in operational planning**

**Description:**
Operational planning does not sufficiently take into account available resources, prioritization of actions according to their impact, interdependencies, and the need for coordination. As a result, implementation issues—delays and risks of downtime, and inefficient use of resources—become challenges to achieving strategic objectives.

**Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)

The PSMN will benefit from the BEN’s experience managing nutrition programs. The participatory approach used in the development of the PSMN will also be beneficial in facilitating a common understanding of the strategic objectives and action plans. However, the wider scope of the PSMN and the strengthening of the multisectoral approach adds complexity to its implementation. Transferring responsibility for implementation of the SAPs to the sectors also introduces a project management risk. Furthermore, the lack of concrete results indicators for the PSMN is a barrier to optimal program planning. This underscores the importance that the PSMN attaches to nutrition research, which aims to support the development of knowledge on the effectiveness of policies and foster a shift toward the optimal management of nutrition programs.

**Impact:** average (2)

Lack of coherence in operational planning can weaken the degree to which selected actions are relevant to PSMN strategic objectives. It can also affect the timeframe for completion, effectiveness, and efficiency in relation to the resources mobilized.

**Recommended mitigating measures:**

Deussom et al. (2018) made the following recommendations: (1) ensure multisectoral coordination of the nutrition sector; (2) ensure multisectoral strategic and operational planning; (3) establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system; and (4) make strategic investments in training and research. Administrative organization and financing constraints make these measures more difficult to implement (2), but their implementation would significantly reduce the level of criticality from high (4) to low (2).

**Risks Related to the Mobilization of Financial Resources**

The first issue in the mobilization of financial resources for the PSMN is securing funding for the actions in the DPPD and annual performance plans of the sectoral ministries. In a context of high revenue and expenditure inertia, as well as competition between nutrition and other ministries’ priorities, the scale-up of the PSMN may face significant constraints. Risks to the mobilization of state funding are related to the availability of financial resources, the alignment of the PSMN with the PSE and sectoral policies, and management of procedures for disbursement and implementation.

Financing for nutrition has thus far been dominated by TFP contributions, which is an important risk factor
due to the serious consequences of a failure to maintain their level of commitment. Several factors may influence TFPs’ level of contribution, including their: (1) knowledge of intervention strategies; (2) capacity to prepare and promote projects and programs; (3) familiarity with procedures for the ratification of conventions and enforcement of due diligence in fulfilling the conditions of entry; (4) knowledge of the procedures for the procurement of goods and services; and (5) quality of monitoring and evaluation of projects and programs.

Financing of a plan of the magnitude of the PSMN cannot be achieved without substantial contributions from the private sector (such as businesses and producers) and nonstate institutions (such as NGOs, civil society associations, and foundations). For instance, the private sector can invest in public projects with high economic profitability, under market conditions, through public-private partnerships. Alternatively, if not strictly a public service, project implementation can be carried out under their technical and financial responsibility as private entities. The role of the state would then be limited to identifying opportunities, promoting them to investors, and facilitating their implementation.

Involvement of the private sector and nonstate institutions can also be accomplished through results-based financing. Corporate social responsibility also provides opportunities to mobilize private resources to finance nutrition projects for companies whose corporate goal is aligned with PSMN projects. The economic importance of nutrition-related sectors enhances the potential for this in Senegal.

For public projects financed or managed in partnership with the private sector, project preparation capacity, in-depth knowledge of project risks, and the capacity to promote investments, negotiate contracts, and monitor their implementation, are important factors of financial risk management.

Four risks related to the mobilization of financial resources were identified (table A.2):

- Insufficient mobilization of public resources
  - Description: Poor management and coordination of the budgetary process resulting in: (1) risks of resource allocation unfavorable to the PSMN; (2) selection of projects that do not align with the priorities of the PSMN; or (3) selection of projects that do not align across sectors.
  - Exposure of the PSMN: high (3)
  - Impact: high (3)
  - Recommended mitigating measures: The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) ensure the multisectoral coordination of the nutrition sector (Deusso et al. 2018); (2) coordinate budget planning with the other sectors; (3) increase the budget lines for nutrition for the CLM and ministries; and (4) explore the feasibility of creating a nutrition financing fund through taxying products harmful to health. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is difficult (1) and level of criticality would remain high (9). The mobilization of public financing will be critical for the success of the PSMN.
Insufficient mobilization of donor funding

- **Description:**
  Limited capacity to absorb the funding provided by TFPs causing delays in the implementation—or constraints on the management—of the PSMN.
- **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  Nutrition financing has thus far been primarily provided by TFPs that consider it paramount in their intervention strategies. Their commitments for 2019 remain strong, and the PSMN could still attract additional support. However, dependence on donors poses risks: (1) bilateral aid—a predominant share of donor financing—is declining, although it is partly made up for by multilateral assistance; (2) the significant contribution from BACDI is a strength but—with respect to dependence on any single country—also a risk in the face of possible policy changes; and (3) donors’ conditionalities, which are not always aligned with nutrition policy priorities, particularly in the choice of geographic zones of intervention. Additional risks relate to the familiarity with donor strategies and financing management procedures to ensure the full use of appropriations.
- **Impact:** high (3)
  TFPs contribution to nutrition financing remains strong. Even if the priority is to diversify funding sources, given the magnitude of need, the ability to mobilize TFPs will be critical to the successful implementation of the PSMN in its early stages.
- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) develop strategies for the creation of a system for nutrition financing and financial resource mobilization (Deusson et al. 2018); (2) organize a donors’ roundtable to promote maximum and optimal mobilization of nutrition financing; (3) establish a framework for regular consultation with TFPs to coordinate interventions and monitor commitments and achievements; and (4) introduce nutrition-related conditionalities in budget support. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is moderate (2)—having fewer constraints than raising public financing—and would help cut the level of criticality from very high (9) to high (6).

Insufficient mobilization of community resources

- **Description:**
  Inadequate consideration of the potential of CLs and households in the financing and management of nutrition activities, limiting initiative, and the scale and effectiveness of actions on the ground.
- **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  Community action encompasses CL interventions and the contributions of targeted populations. CLs are an important link in the management of actions in the fight against malnutrition. Households participate through the organization of actions at the community level and financing of nutrition-related health expenses. A major challenge in the deployment of the PSMN at scale is the need to increase the involvement of local communities in the management and financing of activities. Insufficient budgetary resources at the local level are a constraint but levers exist: human resource mobilization, household financial resources, voluntary participation, and the contributions of an active diaspora in supporting families and communities of origin.
- **Impact:** high (3)
  Lack of involvement of local communities would constitute a considerable lost opportunity, notably for the development of income-generating activities, pronutrition economic sectors, and improved impact of the diaspora. It would impede decentralization of nutrition policy, which increasingly promotes more autonomous management, centered on the real needs of the local population with stronger and more sustainable impact.
- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) increase budget lines for nutrition actions for CLs; and (2) promote more active participation of the local population, associations, and the diaspora in the definition, funding, and implementation of priority actions. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is difficult (1), and special efforts will be needed to ensure greater involvement of local populations and the diaspora in the implementation of activities. The level of criticality remains high (9).
Insufficient private sector involvement

- **Description:**
  Weak involvement of the private sector in PSMN efforts toward the development of pronutrition economic activities, delaying provision of goods from the agricultural, fishing, and agroindustrial processing sectors aimed at improving nutritional status.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  The private sector’s current contribution to nutrition financing seems insignificant. The private sector can play a greater role in financing nutrition programs as part of corporate social responsibility initiatives. The private sector is especially critical for the development of nutrition-specific activities by improving the availability of healthy and nutritious food, and infrastructure financing through public-private partnerships. Merely advocating in favor of private sector involvement is not enough; opportunities—for investors and institutions promoting business development, such as APIX and ADEPME—to take advantage of the economic potential of the PSMN have not yet been fully tapped.

- **Impact:** high (3)
  Greater private sector involvement in nutrition policy could have significant effects. As is the case in other African countries, such as Kenya, corporate social responsibility initiatives could be a source of financing for nutrition programs and projects; through public-private partnerships, the private sector could help mobilize substantial funding for projects with high economic profitability. It is primarily the private sector that is responsible for the development of agriculture, breeding, fishing, and processing activities. Weak participation of the private sector would impede achievement of PSMN objectives.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) advocate for industrial and agrifood processors and producers to improve the availability of healthy and nutritious food; (2) advocate for the development of corporate social responsibility initiatives for nutrition; and (3) promote investment opportunities in the production of healthy and nutritious foods and public-private partnership projects, in partnership with institutions that support the private sector (such as APIX, ADEPME, and ANIDA). These recommended mitigating measures are easily feasible (3) and will reduce the level of criticality from very high (9) to high (6).

Risks Related to the Mobilization of Human Resources

The quality of human resources is crucial in the performance of any organization. The risks to human resource mobilization are related to the ability of government and partners to meet the need for capacity building and recruitment, provide the means for competitive wages to retain or renew human resources, and facilitate the availability of needed skills in the market.

Three risks related to the mobilization of human resources were identified (table A.3):

**Low capacity to address human resource needs for coordination of the PSMN**

- **Description:**
  Inadequate staff lacking the necessary qualifications to carry out the coordination tasks within BEN causes inefficiencies in the management of the PSMN.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
  BEN has a multidisciplinary staff with diversified expertise. The positions are filled through transparent calls for applications and rigorous procedures. However, the staff specialized in nutrition is insufficient, and the regional offices are understaffed. Their status limits career prospects and the ability to attract and retain talent. This issue will be addressed in the development of an optimal institutional framework for the PSMN. CLM’s BEN (or the body that will take over) will be a shared competence center serving all sectors and stakeholders, and will need a stable pool of qualified human resources.

- **Impact:** high (3)
  Low availability of human resources for CLM’s BEN would have a high impact on the quality of sectoral
coordination, performance of management, and resources for the implementation of the PSMN.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the recommended mitigating measures are: (1) strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively; (2) strengthen human resources and incentives; and (3) improve remuneration of nutrition professionals. Recruitment and remuneration measures are generally difficult to implement. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

### Low capacity to address human resources needs for implementation of the SAPs

- **Description:**
  Constraints on the recruitment of ministry staff to implement SAPs, which would limit their capacity to manage projects and programs and, thereby, achieve sectoral objectives.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
  Recruitment for the ministries is managed by the Ministry of Public Service, which has rigid procedures and compensation systems that provide few incentives. Recruitment quotas by sector make it impossible to fill all positions, and many remain vacant. Moreover, high staff instability is not conducive to effective coordination.

  Additional risk lies in the difficulty of assessing the capacity of various ministries (whether staffing, workload, experience, or skills) to adequately manage their SAPs. This risk, which is unevenly distributed across ministries, calls for an audit of the organizational structure and the resources allocated to each ministry with respect to the interventions planned in the PSMN. Beyond the provision of financial resources, TFP support will increasingly need to focus on strengthening human resource capacity. This constitutes a critical challenge for implementation of the PSMN.

- **Impact:** high (3)
  Insufficient staffing would limit capacity to implement the projects and programs of the PSMN and increase the risks of a multitier “take-over” of the SAPs by ministries, or a “race to the bottom” likely to affect or even undermine the multisectoral implementation process of the PSMN.

### Instability of essential staff

- **Description:**
  Maintaining specialized and experienced staff in a context of low job security and limited opportunities for career development creates the risk of departure of personnel to other projects or other countries offering better visibility or more attractive prospects.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  The credibility of the multisectoral approach requires appropriate levels of qualification and stability of the staff supporting or seconded to ministries to manage SAPs and coordinate PSMN implementation. These staff are essential to the proper running of the system. Because of their significant influence on the quality of implementation of the ministries’ SAPs, the instability of essential staff is a major risk that must be mitigated. The high level of staff instability has been noted in several studies in this series, particularly Deussom et al. (2018), and during interviews conducted for this study. The precarious nature of employment contracts within BEN and the unattractive system of remuneration in the public sector are not likely to reduce this risk of instability.

- **Impact:** high (3)
  The nutrition sector in Senegal is already affected by a shortage of qualified personnel. A loss of even some of these specialists would have adverse consequences for the quality of the management of...
projects and programs, on the sharing and development of knowledge, and on the effectiveness and efficiency of PSMN implementation.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the recommended mitigating measures are: (1) strengthen CLM organization and leadership to enable it to provide specialized human resources; (2) improve the remuneration of nutrition professionals; and (3) make strategic investments in training and research. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2), and the implementation of the measures would reduce the level of criticality from very high (9) to high (6).

### Risks Related to the Mobilization of Other Resources

Support for PSMN implementation from the government and TFPs also includes contributions of facilities, equipment, technology, and goods and services.

Three risks related to the mobilization of other resources were identified (table A.4):

- **Inadequate provision of logistical and material resources by government**
  - **Description:**
    Inadequate availability of logistical and material resources from government and sectoral administrative bodies needed by the CLM to fulfill its mission effectively.
  - **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
    Government can support PSMN stakeholders in fulfilling their mission by providing them with, for example, offices, equipment, information systems, training, and security systems. The resources made available are generally limited to office space and logistical support, which are considered to be inadequate and often in an advanced state of disrepair (Duessom N. et al. 2018). The lack of logistical resources makes it difficult to carry out field activities, notably project monitoring.
  - **Impact:** low (1)
    The lack of nonfinancial support from the government can affect working conditions and, to some extent, the effectiveness of the management of the PSMN, but does not prevent the accomplishment of the essential mission.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  Advocacy by nutrition stakeholders is recommended to improve the technological and logistical resources and infrastructure of institutions in charge of nutrition (Deussom et al. 2018), such as by providing necessary office space, information technology resources, material donations, and technical assistance from TFPs. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is low (1) because of a lack of public buildings and equipment; the level of criticality would remain low (2).

### Inadequate mobilization of TFPs for assistance, training, and communication

- **Description:**
  Inadequate use of TFPs’ capacities in technical assistance, training, and communication, which is a significant lost opportunity for the delivery of high-impact interventions.
- **Exposure of the PSMN:** low (1)
  Analysis of the context of PSMN implementation underscores donors’ strong commitment to nutrition (Spray 2018), but also shows the constraints from the limited growth in ODA (Offosse N. 2018). New movements, initiatives, and institutions in the fight against malnutrition have supported government capacity building through their expertise, research, training, mobilization of partners, and opportunities for exchanging good practices, as evidenced by the development of the PSMN. Senegal can build on its good relations with TFPs to facilitate the training of staff and the support of communication and change management.
- **Impact:** average (2)
  Communication, technical assistance and training of stakeholders and the population are critical for PSMN implementation. The mobilization of TFPs can play an important role in its success.
Recommended mitigating measures:
Nutrition stakeholders will benefit from leveraging the technical assistance resources of TFPs (Deussom et al. 2018) notably for training, communication, and research needs. The feasibility of this recommended mitigating measure is average (2) due to an already high level of donor involvement and level of criticality remains low (2).

Weak capacity for mobilizing nonfinancial support of communities and private partners

- **Description:**
  Low participation of local communities (including populations, CLs, and producers), limiting their voluntary contributions to the implementation of nutrition activities at the ground level.
- **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  Nonfinancial support is not regularly monitored and documented, but can be a significant contribution to nutrition actions on the ground. Volunteer staff, logistical support from CLs, and products for use in demonstrations (such as food demonstrations) can make major contributions to the implementation of the PSMN. Communities must take ownership of the PSMN and carry out their own projects. This potential is yet to be fully tapped.
- **Impact:** high (3)
  The effects of community mobilization are numerous and significant: facilitating project management, leveraging voluntary contributions, ownership of PSMN objectives, and more sustainable results. Failure to take advantage of this potential in the implementation of the PSMN will impede achievement of expected results and their long-term sustainability.
- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) promote more active participation of local populations in nutrition activities; (2) encourage community-based competition by sharing successful experiences; and (3) report back on the impact of projects at the community level. Feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2) due to serious constraints on community mobilization. However, successful implementation of these mitigating measures could markedly reduce the level of criticality from very high (9) to high (6).

Organizational and Operational Risks

Responsibility for implementation of SAPs falls to the ministries. Several factors may influence the ability of the sectors to carry out the nutrition actions assigned to them in their SAPs. These include: (1) the alignment of the actions with the priorities of the sector; (2) the complexity of the projects; (3) the competence of the organization in the preparation of projects, formalization and documentation of management processes, monitoring and evaluation, and control and audit systems; and (4) the experience and stability of the implementation teams.

As part of a multisectoral and multistakeholder approach, the sharing of responsibilities in the implementation of the SAPs requires strong coordination to ensure convergence toward the strategic objectives of the PSMN. Poor coordination is a risk that can occur at several levels:

- Intrasectoral coordination among departmental planners and other ministry entities
- Intersectoral coordination between the different ministerial departments involved in the implementation of the PSMN
- Coordination at the local level between central and decentralized bodies
- Coordination with the various TFPs

Eight organizational and operational risks were identified (table A.5):

**Poor alignment of SAPs with sector priorities**

- **Description:**
  Weak links between the PSMN and the sectors result in less engagement of sectors in the implementation of PSMN projects and risk resource allocation unfavorable to nutrition when resources are limited.
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Exposure of the PSMN: average (2)
It is essential that PSMN actions be aligned and consistent with the strategic objectives of the sectors carrying out nutrition-specific or nutrition-sensitive actions. Development of the PSMN was participatory, with strong participation of all sectors, each contributing to the development of action plans, technical validation of SAPs, and the setting of budgets. However, scale-up of a multisectoral plan is a major challenge that requires convergence, coherence, and coordination to achieve common strategic objectives. For administrative bodies that typically operate in silos, with high variability in project management capacity according to financial or political constraints, there is a significant risk of misalignment among sectors in the absence of a coercive support and coordination framework.

Impact: high (3)
With multisectoral management of the PSMN, ministerial departments have significant responsibility for the implementation of their SAPs. Hence, the success of the PSMN will be highly dependent on the priority allotted by the sectors to nutrition projects and actions.

Recommended mitigating measures:
The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) ensure multisectoral coordination with the nutrition sector (Deussom et al. 2018); (2) ensure multisectoral strategic and operational planning (Deussom et al. 2018); and (3) include in the SAP performance objectives targets that are consistent with the PSMN. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2), as they do not require a major financial commitment. The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

Low capacity of some sectors to prepare and manage projects of similar complexity

Description:
Weak project management capacity among sectors, which will cause delays and inefficiencies in the management of the SAPs and in multisectoral coordination.

Exposure of the PSMN: average (2)
Different administrative bodies have different levels of competence in project management, but the need for capacity building in project management in general—and nutrition programs in particular—was expressed by most stakeholders interviewed. Results-based and project-based management approaches are still new in Senegal. Moreover, the relevant human resources are not always adequate or stable. As a result, development and conservation of nutrition knowledge is often difficult. Scaling up nutrition policy will pose challenges for several sectors that need to integrate new skills and adapt to collaborative work in a multisectoral framework. This risk underscores the importance of the evolution of the role of CLM and BEN regarding their mandate to provide support to sectors in project and program management.

Impact: high (3)
Success of the PSMN depends on the efficient and coordinated implementation of SAPs; weak capacity to manage sectoral actions would have a major impact on PSMN results.

Recommended mitigating measures:
The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) strengthen project management capacity (Deussom et al. 2018); (2) strengthen the support provided by CLM’s BEN in the preparation and management of projects (Deussom et al. 2018); and (3) give CLM’s BEN the role of project manager for critical projects during the first phase of the PSMN. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

Poor management of public procurement and expenditure procedures

Description:
Poor understanding of public management procedures causing delays in PSMN implementation within the sectors, and reducing the quality of multisectoral coordination.

Exposure of the PSMN: average (2)
BEN operates through procedures established in accordance with the public procurement code, World
Bank guidelines, and donors’ procedures. An evaluation by the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group of the performance of the nutrition program found the financial management of projects and programs to be exemplary (Vaillancourt 2018). Sectoral entities are subject to public procurement and financial management procedures, but have no autonomy from their ministries. Under the UEMOA’s new harmonized framework for public finance, entities will not only have better visibility of the budgeted actions on a multiannual timetable, but also an information system that facilitates their management and coordination. In the first years of the PSMN, it would be advisable to strengthen support of MEFP advisors responsible for monitoring budgetary procedures for all sectors.

**Impact:** average (2)
The public resources allocated to nutrition are limited and, like all public funds, are subject to cash-flow constraints and risks of cancellation over time. Poor management of public procedures would exacerbate this constraint and make the coordination of actions by the various sectors more difficult.

**Recommended mitigating measures:**
The recommended mitigating measures are:
(1) strengthen capacity in public finance procedures (Deussom et al. 2018); (2) strengthen the support provided by CLM’s BEN in the management of projects (Deussom et al. 2018); and (3) give CLM’s BEN the role of project manager for critical projects during the first phase of the PSMN. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2). The level of criticality would remain high (4).

**Poor Management of TFP procedures**

**Description:**
Poor understanding of TFP procedures causing delays or blockages in the provision of financing or in the use of the funds.

**Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
This risk seems low in the case of BEN, which has a proven track record in the mobilization of financing and financial management of projects and programs. It is more relevant for sectoral entities given their increased responsibility in the transfer of operational management. Capacity building with regard to donor procedures would be opportune. CLM’s BEN will have to strengthen its capacity as the cornerstone of the PSMN, providing advice and expertise that covers the entire “value chain.” This role will be closer to that of an agency than that of a unit, yet with the same high level of institutional anchoring as today.

**Impact:** high (3)
Owing to the importance of the contribution of TFPs to nutrition policy, management of their procedures is critical to avoid the risks of delay or interruption in the provision of funds. Beyond the immediate financial constraints, the credibility of the PSMN and, consequently, its subsequent financial support could be affected.

**Recommended mitigating measures:**
The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) strengthen knowledge regarding donor procedures (Deussom et al. 2018); (2) strengthen the support provided by CLM’s BEN in the management of projects (Deussom et al. 2018); and (3) give CLM’s BEN the role of project manager for critical projects during the first phase of the PSMN. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

**Poor intrasectoral coordination**

**Description:**
The internal organization of the ministries and entities responsible for implementation of SAPs does not enable coordinated management of pronutrition actions.

**Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
The level of competence in PSMN management practices varies by ministry but, as noted by Deussom et al. (2018), in general, intrasectoral collaboration is poor, hindering horizontal and vertical interactions within the sectors. This risk is more important at the launch of the PSMN and requires support from a strengthened CLM. A phased implementation of the PSMN would allow CLM’s BEN to maintain—in the first phase—management of certain critical actions.
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Impact: high (3)
The impact of this risk is high, at least at the beginning of the PSMN’s implementation, due to the significant responsibility vested in the sectors for proper management of SAPs.

Recommended mitigating measures:
The recommended mitigating measures are:
(1) establish intrasectoral nutrition committees to coordinate actions among the departments; and
(2) encourage intrasectoral collaboration on nutrition, using CLM focal points as promoters (Deussom et al. 2018). These recommended mitigating measures are easily feasible (3). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

Insufficient intersectoral coordination

Description:
Weak links between sectoral activities, making it difficult to have a coordinated response to nutrition-related problems.

Exposure of the PSMN: high (3)
Institutional anchoring of CLM to the Prime Minister’s office has strengths, including administrative authority and designated focal points that should, in principle, facilitate coordination with the sectors. However, CLM is perceived more as an operational body, due to its management of the Programme de Renforcement de la Nutrition (Nutrition Enhancement Program) (PRN), than a sectoral coordinating body. There are bridges between the sectors, but operationally the sectors lack representatives able to speak with authority about nutrition. The variability in nutrition expertise among representatives is not conducive to effective coordination. In addition, coordination is hampered by rivalry between the health sector and the CNSA, each of which claims primary responsibility for nutrition. The participatory PSMN preparation process has fostered convergence among sectors that should be consolidated through the establishment of a higher coordinating body at CLM level.

Impact: high (3)
The multisectoral approach is crucial for the effective implementation of the PSMN. Poor coordination would have a negative impact on its efficiency, effectiveness, and credibility.

Recommended mitigating measures:
As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the recommended mitigating measures are: (1) strengthen multisector and multistakeholder coordination at the CLM; and (2) strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2) because the financial constraints are not high. Their implementation would reduce the level of criticality from very high (9) to high (6).

Poor coordination at the regional and local levels

Description:
Poor coordination among stakeholders at the regional and local levels, reducing benefits and impact of nutrition interventions.

Exposure of the PSMN: average (2)
Sectoral interventions are carried out by decentralized services whose efficiency depends on the availability of human, logistical, and material resources. On the whole, the workload exceeds capacity. Coordination is carried out by administrative authorities (such as CLs, departments, and regions) under a framework that is not conducive to close collaboration between sectors. For BEN, the management of interventions at the local level is delegated to partners (the sectors, Agences d’Execution Communautaire (Community Executing Agencies), or the private sector). Coordination is satisfactory at the regional level, but there are inadequate human resources, expertise in nutrition-related issues, and coverage of decentralized services at the local level.

Constraints on the management of activities at the local level are also related to poor appropriation by local stakeholders and elected officials and to a disconnect between national nutrition policy and local priorities. There is a need for better information about the nutrition strategy for local stakeholders, more regular consultation on local priorities, and better integration of local priorities into SAPs.
Impact: high (3)
Coordination at the local level is crucial to ensuring effective service delivery to beneficiaries. The local setting is also dependent on the quality of sectoral coordination. Poor coordination at the local level can have a significant impact on implementation of the PSMN.

Recommended mitigating measures:
The key mitigating measure recommended by Deussom et al. (2018) is to strengthen multisectoral coordination at the regional and local levels under the leadership of the Bureaux Exécutifs Régional (Regional Executive Bureaus), and through consultation with the administrative authorities, decentralized bodies, and CLs. The feasibility of this mitigating measure is average (2). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

Poor coordination with TFPs

Description:
Lack of coordination between the government and TFPs on nutrition financing, such that efforts are channeled toward activities or geographic areas that do not align with priorities of the PSMN.

Exposure of the PSMN: average (2)
There are several consultation frameworks with TFPs, including the national multistakeholder and multisectoral platform established by the SUN Movement, and support provided by the government of Canada in several areas through multilateral institutions such as UNICEF, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and WHO. However, consultation with TFPs is not sufficient to fully mobilize them to finance nutrition. The nutrition sector does not yet have enough visibility to induce policy makers to take a strong coordinated approach with TFPs: Not all partners have the same level of awareness and understanding of nutrition-related issues, and they may have different priorities for nutrition-related cooperation (for example, preferences for gender-based interventions or geographic orientation of interventions). Effectively, there is no comprehensive TFP consultation framework on nutrition; implementation of the PSMN could be an opportunity to put one in place by formalizing a common results framework involving all stakeholders. A donor roundtable would also be useful for optimizing partner coordination.

Impact: high (3)
The impact of poor coordination with TFPs is potentially significant given their high level of contribution to nutrition financing in Senegal. Given the multisectoral framework, poor coordination might also adversely affect opportunities for aligning interventions with Senegal’s priorities.

Recommended mitigating measures:
As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the recommended mitigating measure is to establish a framework for regular consultation with TFPs to coordinate interventions and monitor commitments and achievements. This mitigating measure is easily feasible (3) given the commitments of the current TFPs. The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

Risks Related to Monitoring, Evaluation, and Control

The monitoring, review, evaluation, and audit system is an essential component of results-based management. Conducted in a reliable and timely manner, it contributes to improved program management, knowledge sharing, compliance with stakeholder rules and commitments, a process of continuous improvement, and promotion of results and recognition of merit.

An inadequate control system risks, in the short term, ineffectiveness in the implementation of activities, inefficiency in the use of resources, and delays in achieving strategic objectives. Noncompliance with the rules of and commitments to stakeholders can lead to suspension or cessation of funding. In the longer term, a lack of visibility of the results of the PSMN limits the possibility for feedback and is not conducive to continued commitment of government and TFPs.
The evaluation of the PSMN’s results and impact and the incorporation of feedback are important capacity-building activities that will improve the management of subsequent phases or plans.

Two risks related to monitoring, evaluation, and control were identified (table A.6):

**Inadequate system for the monitoring and evaluation of sectoral activities and the PSMN overall**

- **Description:**
  A system for the collection of information, monitoring of results, and evaluation of impact that does not provide visibility to the progress of the PSMN or deviations from objectives and does not enable effective and efficient management of actions or clear delegation of responsibilities.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)

- **Impact:** high (3)

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system; (2) develop and deploy a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan; and (3) strengthen stakeholder capacity for monitoring and evaluation. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2) because the financial constraints are not high. The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

**Inadequate financial monitoring, control, and audit system**

- **Description:**
  Insufficient transparency of financial management or compliance with the rules of and commitments to stakeholders, which may cause delays in the provision of resources and lead to suspension or cessation of funding and activities.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)

- **Impact:** high (3)

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system; (2) develop and deploy a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan; and (3) strengthen stakeholder capacity for monitoring and evaluation. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2) because the financial constraints are not high. The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).
the IFIS within MEFP, which is expected to help produce periodic financial reports. The monitoring and evaluation system should be designed to bring high visibility to these actions within the framework of multisectoral programs.

- **Impact:** average (2)
  Poor quality of accounting and financial management would affect the quality of PSMN activity monitoring, performance management, accountability, and performance justification. An inadequate control system and the risk of noncompliance with public procedures and donor commitments could cause delays in the implementation of activities, and undermine partner confidence, which might delay or cancel funding.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) strengthen financial management and control capacities (Deussom et al. 2018); (2) strengthen the support of CLM’s BEN in the management and control of projects (Deussom et al. 2018); and (3) promote the rapid deployment of IFIS in the sectors most involved in the implementation of the PSMN. The feasibility of these recommended mitigating measures is average (2), and their implementation would reduce the level of criticality from high (4) to low (2).

### Risks Related to Communication and Change Management

The management of plans and programs often imposes changes in behavior and sometimes breaks among actors. For the PSMN, in addition to the targeted populations, it is also important to focus on the stakeholders responsible for implementing SAPs. These stakeholders will perceive or undergo changes related to their positions and roles, which may require communication, sensitization, training, and assistance to curb resistance to change and facilitate ownership of the new strategy.

Three risks related to communication and change management were identified (table A.7):

- **Inadequate behavior change communication for target populations**
  - **Description:**
    Low investment in communication, leading to inadequate ownership of PSMN issues, poor understanding of the changes necessary for proper nutrition, and rigidity of behavior.
  - **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
  - **Impact:** high (3)
    Preventing lifestyle and eating habits that drive malnutrition and nutrition-related noncommunicable diseases are a major challenge of the PSMN that requires community education and sensitization. Investment in communication for behavior change is addressed in the PSMN’s proposed actions for communication and advocacy in the nutrition sector. A communication plan will be developed to ensure implementation of these actions.
  - **Recommended mitigating measures:**
    As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), it is recommended that a communication and advocacy plan for the nutrition sector be developed and implemented. This mitigating measure is easily feasible (3). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

- **Insufficient support for internal communication and change management needs of PSMN stakeholders**
  - **Description:**
    Insufficient attention to and investment in the need for adaptation among stakeholders in the implementation of the PSMN, leading to resistance to change and difficulties in coordinating and mobilizing human resources.
  - **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  - **Impact:**
    The PSMN will require a significant shift in the attitude of actors whose missions and modes of coordination
are expected to evolve. Internal communication and change management for PSMN stakeholders need strengthening; the communication and change management plan will be essential to facilitate an understanding of the roles of various stakeholders, their accountability, and the coordination of the actions to achieve PSMN strategic objectives.

- **Impact:** average (2)
  - Ill-preparedness for change on the part of stakeholders could lead to coordination difficulties and lost effectiveness in PSMN implementation.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), the recommended mitigating measures are: (1) strengthen internal communication between stakeholders in the nutrition sector; and (2) develop and implement a change management plan for nutrition stakeholders. These measures are easily feasible (3). The level of criticality would remain high, although reduced from (6) to (4).

### Poor communication of PSMN results

- **Description:**
  Poor communication of the results of the PSMN could (1) weaken political commitment; (2) undermine confidence of the population, stakeholders, and partners regarding its relevance; and (3) reduce resources for its implementation.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** average (2)
  - There are numerous ways in which the CLM, BEN, and sectoral entities communicate, including annual reports, mass communication campaigns, and radio and TV programming during monitoring meetings. The public’s awareness of nutrition and related interventions, however, remains very low. The monitoring and evaluation system and the communication plan envisaged as part of the PSMN aims to address this component. A major condition for success of the PSMN will be the provision of sufficient resources to carry out these actions effectively.

- **Impact:** average (2)
  - In the context of results-based management, communication is important for reinforcing the credibility of the plan and maintaining commitment of the population, stakeholders, policy makers, and partners. Poor communication could affect the availability of resources and the effectiveness of nutrition actions.

- **Recommended mitigating measures:**
  As noted in Deussom et al. (2018), it is recommended that a communication and advocacy plan for the nutrition sector be developed and implemented. This measure is easily feasible (3). The level of criticality would remain high (4).

### Exceptional Risks

The context in which the PSMN is implemented will have a crucial impact on the ability of stakeholders to achieve its strategic objectives, even if financial and human resources are sufficient.

The following exceptional risk has been identified (table A.8):

### Deterioration of political, economic, social, or climatic conditions

- **Description:**
  A significant external shock (such as an economic crisis, food price hike, drought or flood that negatively impacts production, or a political or social crisis), exacerbating the precariousness of households most vulnerable to malnutrition and limiting budgetary resources available to support them.

- **Exposure of the PSMN:** high (3)
  - Statistically, these shocks have appeared regularly and, at times, have lasted over long periods, such as the drought of the 1970s and 1980s. During the past 12 years, at least three major shocks have occurred: floods in 2005; a food price hike in 2007 and 2008; and poor rainfall in 2011. These risks are compounded by long-term unfavorable trends in agricultural production conditions: climate change, soil degradation, and rural migration.

- **Impact:** high (3)
  - Periods of shock increase the risk of declining nutrition status. Because the cost of food is a major
proportion of a household budget, any pressure on income or prices will have direct consequences on the quantity and quality of consumption. A survey conducted on the effects of the shocks on the prices of food staples in 2007 and 2008 (WFP et al. 2008) showed that at least 10 percent of households reduced the number of daily meals, and 30 percent to 40 percent of households reduced spending on vegetables, fruits, meat, and dairy products in 2008 compared to the same period in 2007.

✎ Recommended mitigating measures:
The following mitigating measures are recommended: (1) coordinate management of exceptional risks with food security agencies; (2) promote climate risk insurance; (3) promote the development of off-season farming; and (4) diversify production and promote local products and processing. The feasibility of implementing these recommended mitigating measures is difficult (1) because of their complexity and financial requirements. The level of criticality would remain very high (9).
Summary and Classification of Risks

Table 4 classifies sources of risk into four categories, based on their level of criticality. The classifications reveal several major constraints on the implementation of the PSMN, which should be removed to ensure the best chance of achieving the defined strategic goals.

The commitment of policy makers to nutrition must be better guaranteed and the institutional framework for nutrition strengthened. Alignment of the PSMN with Senegal’s economic and social priorities should be improved.

Risks emerge at all levels in the mobilization of financial resources. The scale-up of nutrition policy entails significant financial needs. There are funding constraints from (1) the public budget; (2) donors, despite a context conducive to the support of nutrition policies; (3) communities; and (4) the private sector. However, the analysis of mitigating measures shows potential for improving the coverage of the PSMN’s financial needs by better mobilizing the private sector, local communities and producers, and donors. Nonfinancial support of local communities also supports implementation of projects at the decentralized level.

The training and availability of nutrition specialists and, especially, their stability in critical positions are major challenges for the effective implementation of the PSMN. The risks are particularly high for coordination, but also within sectors that need to strengthen their capacity for effective integration of nutrition.

Operational risks are strong, but the experience gained by the CLM in project management and coordination helps to reduce impact. However, the risk related to intersectoral coordination remains at a very high level of criticality.

Recommended measures to mitigate other risks to the implementation of the PSMN include establishing systems for monitoring and evaluation of sectoral activities and the PSMN as a whole, as well as a communication and advocacy plan backed by sufficient resources to carry out behavior change communication for the target population as well as supporting the internal communication and change management needs of PSMN stakeholders.

Finally, exceptional risks related to deteriorating political, economic, social, or climatic conditions are very high due to their high impact and historically high exposure in Senegal.
TABLE 4: Summary of Risk Assessment

| Impact | Exposure                                                                 |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|   Low  | Low capacity to address human resource needs for coordination of the PSMN |
|   Average | Poor alignment of the PSMN with economic and social priorities        |
|   High | Weak commitment of political leaders                                    |
|        | Insufficient mobilization of public resources                            |
|        | Insufficient mobilization of donor funding                               |
|        | Insufficient mobilization of community resources                         |
|        | Insufficient private sector involvement                                 |
|        | Instability of essential staff                                           |
|        | Weak capacity for mobilizing nonfinancial support of communities and private partners |
|        | Insufficient intersectoral coordination                                  |
|        | Deterioration of political, economic, social, or climatic conditions    |

| Average | Inadequate mobilization of TFPs for assistance, training, and communication |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|         | Lack of coherence in operational planning                                  |
|         | Poor management of public procurement and expenditure procedures           |
|         | Insufficient support for internal communication and change management needs of PSMN stakeholders |
|         | Inadequate financial monitoring, control, and audit system                 |
|         | Poor communication of PSMN results                                         |

| Low     | Inadequate provision of logistical and material resources by government   |
Risk management requires an organization and system of governance that allows for regular and rigorous monitoring over time to ensure that risks are controlled and the monitoring system meets risk management objectives. A risk management system of governance is important because the context and risks to the implementation of the PSMN are ever evolving. The following actions are recommended:

- Designate a person in charge of risk management at the CLM
- Promote the development of a risk-aware culture among stakeholders of the PSMN, emphasizing training in risk management and sharing of analyses and experience
- Establish a risk governance system that takes into account risk indicators in the monitoring of the PSMN; conducts quarterly or semiannual follow-up meetings; conducts an annual review by a committee to monitor the context and risks, and to review and update the mapping and analyses and the risk management plan.
The implementation of the PSMN will benefit from Senegal’s successful experience in the reduction of malnutrition and the momentum of TFPs in favor of nutrition. Public reforms introducing results-based management will also allow for multiannual planning of nutrition projects, improved coordination between sectors, and better financial monitoring. However, the shift to multisectoral scale and wider territorial coverage is expected to increase financing needs, the provision of which will be constrained if the availability of public resources and development aid is limited.

This report highlights the need for regular monitoring in several domains to preempt the constraints and ensure an effective and efficient implementation of the PSMN. The following mitigating measures are recommended as priorities:

Institutional risks:
- Advocate for strong political commitment in favor of the PSMN and involve leaders at the highest level in its implementation
- Strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively
- Establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system

Risks related to the mobilization of financial resources:
- Increase the budget lines for nutrition for the CLM and ministries
- Explore the feasibility of creating a nutrition financing fund by taxing products damaging to health
- Organize a donors’ roundtable conference to promote maximum and optimal mobilization of nutrition financing
- Introduce nutrition-related conditionalities in budget support
- Promote more active participation of the local population, associations, and the diaspora in the definition, funding, and implementation of priority actions
- Advocate for industrial and agrifood processors and producers to improve the availability of healthy and nutritious food
Advocate for the development of corporate social responsibility initiatives for nutrition
Promote investment opportunities in the production of healthy and nutritious foods and public-private partnership projects, in partnership with institutions that support the private sector (such as APIX, ADEPME, and ANIDA)

**Risks related to mobilization of human resources:**
- Make strategic investments in training and research

**Organizational and operational risks:**
- Strengthen multisectoral coordination at the regional and local levels

**Risks related to monitoring, evaluation, and control:**
- Develop and deploy a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan

**Risks related to communication and change management:**
- Develop and implement a communication and advocacy plan for the nutrition sector

**Exceptional risks:**
- Coordinate management of exceptional risks with food security agencies
APPENDIX A

Summary of Recommendations for Risk Mitigation
| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                                                                                  | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Weak commitment of political leaders                                 | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Advocate for strong political commitment in favor of the PSMN and involve leaders at the highest level in its implementation                               | 3           | 2        | 3      | 6                   | CLM-BEN, ministries, TFPs             |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Enhance the value of the PSMN within the framework of the PSE and Senegal’s SDG commitments for its impact on the levers of emergence (such as human capital, competitiveness, and productivity) and overall economic growth |            |          |        |                     | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Build effective coalitions among key stakeholders to promote the cause of nutrition                                                                       |            |          |        |                     | CLM-BEN, ministries, TFPs             |
| Poor alignment of the PSMN with economic and social priorities       | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Enhance the value of the PSMN within the framework of the PSE and Senegal’s SDG commitments for its impact on the levers of emergence (such as human capital, competitiveness, and productivity) and overall economic growth | 3           | 1        | 3      | 3                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
| Lack of coherence in operational planning                             | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively                                                      | 2           | 1        | 3      | 3                   | President’s office, Prime Minister’s office |
| Weak institutional framework for nutrition                            | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Ensure multisectoral coordination of the nutrition sector                                                                                                     | 2           | 1        | 2      | 2                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Ensure multisectoral strategic and operational planning                                                                                                    |            |          |        |                     | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system                                                                      |            |          |        |                     | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Make strategic investments in training and research                                                                                                         |            |          |        |                     | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |

**TABLE A.1: Institutional Risks**
### TABLE A.2: Risks Related to Mobilization of Financial Resources

| Risks                                      | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                 | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Insufficient mobilization of public resources | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Ensure the multisector coordination of the nutrition sector  
• Coordinate budget planning with other sectors  
• Increase the budget lines for nutrition for the CLM and ministries  
• Explore the feasibility of creating a nutrition financing fund by taxing products damaging to health | 1           | 3        | 3      | 9                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries                                                   |
| Insufficient mobilization of donor funding | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Develop strategies for the creation of a system of nutrition funding and financial resource mobilization  
• Organize a donors’ roundtable conference to promote maximum and optimal mobilization of nutrition financing  
• Establish a framework for regular consultation with TFPs to coordinate interventions and monitor commitments and achievements  
• Introduce nutrition-related conditionalities in budget support | 2           | 2        | 3      | 6                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs                                            |
| Insufficient mobilization of community resources | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Increase budget lines for nutrition actions for CLs  
• Promote more active participation of the local population, associations, and the diaspora in the definition, funding, and implementation of priority actions | 1           | 3        | 3      | 9                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs                                            |
| Insufficient private sector involvement     | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Advocate for industrial and agrifood processors and producers to improve the availability of healthy and nutritious food  
• Advocate for the development of corporate social responsibility initiatives for nutrition  
• Promote investment opportunities in the production of healthy and nutritious foods and public-private partnership projects, in partnership with institutions that support the private sector (such as APIX, ADEPME, and ANIDA) | 3           | 2        | 3      | 6                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs                                            |
### TABLE A.3: Risks Related to Mobilization of Human Resources

| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                 | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Low capacity to address human resource needs for coordination of the PSMN | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively  
  • Strengthen human resources and incentives  
  • Improve the remuneration of nutrition professionals | 2          | 2       | 2                  | 4                        | CLM-BEN                  |
| Low capacity to address human resource needs for implementation of the SAPs | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Strengthen human resources and incentives  
  • Improve the remuneration of nutrition professionals  
  • Develop a national human resource strategy for nutrition  
  • **Make strategic investments in training and research**                     | 1          | 2       | 3                  | 6                        | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
| Instability of essential staff                                       | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Strengthen CLM organization and leadership to enable it to provide specialized human resources  
  • Improve the remuneration of nutrition professionals  
  • Make strategic investments in training and research                      | 2          | 2       | 3                  | 6                        | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs |
## TABLE A.4: Risks Related to Mobilization of Other Resources

| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                 | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Inadequate provision of logistical and material resources by government | 2        | 1      | 2                   | • Advocate to improve the technological and logistical resources and infrastructure of institutions in charge of nutrition | 1           | 2        | 1      | 2                  | CLM-BEN, other ministries  |
| Inadequate mobilization of TFPs for assistance, training, and communication | 1        | 2      | 2                   | • Leverage the technical assistance resources of TFPs                                           | 2           | 1        | 2      | 2                  | CLM-BEN, other ministries, TFPs |
| Weak capacity for mobilizing nonfinancial support of communities and private partners | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Promote more active participation of local populations in nutrition activities                | 2           | 2        | 3      | 6                  | CLM-BEN, other ministries  |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Encourage community-based competition by sharing successful experiences                       |             |          |        |                    |                           |
|                                                                      |          |        |                     | • Report back on the impact of projects at the community level                                 |             |          |        |                    |                           |
### TABLE A.5: Organizational and Operational Risks

| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------------|------------------|
| Poor alignment of SAPs with sector priorities                       | 2        | 3      | 6                   | 2           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries |
| Low capacity of some sectors to prepare and manage projects of similar complexity | 2        | 3      | 6                   | 2           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, other ministries |
| Poor management of public procurement and expenditure procedures    | 2        | 2      | 4                   | 2           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries |
| Poor management of TFP procedures                                   | 2        | 3      | 6                   | 2           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries |
| Poor intrasectoral coordination                                     | 2        | 3      | 6                   | 3           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | Sectoral ministries |
| Insufficient intersectoral coordination                              | 3        | 3      | 9                   | 2           | 2        | 3      | 6                   | CLM-BEN, other ministries |
| Poor coordination at the regional and local levels                  | 2        | 3      | 6                   | 2           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, other ministries |
| Poor coordination with TFPs                                         | 2        | 3      | 6                   | 3           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries |

- **Recommended mitigating measures**
  - Ensure multisectoral coordination with the nutrition sector
  - Ensure multisectoral strategic and operational planning
  - Include in the performance targets objectives that are consistent with the PSMN
  - Strengthen project management capacity
  - Strengthen the support provided by CLM’s BEN in the preparation and management of projects
  - Give CLM’s BEN the role of project manager for critical projects during the first phase of the PSMN
  - Strengthen capacity in public finance procedures
  - Strengthen the support provided by CLM’s BEN in the management of projects
  - Give CLM’s BEN the role of project manager for critical projects during the first phase of the PSMN
  - Strengthen knowledge regarding donor procedures
  - Strengthen the support provided by CLM’s BEN in the management of projects
  - Give CLM’s BEN the role of project manager for critical projects during the first phase of the PSMN
  - Establish intrasectoral nutrition committees to coordinate actions among the departments
  - Encourage intrasectoral collaboration on nutrition using CLM focal points as promoters
  - Strengthen multisector and multistakeholder coordination at the CLM level
  - Strengthen the organization and leadership of the CLM to ensure it can fulfill its mission effectively
  - **Strengthen multisectoral coordination at the regional and local levels**
  - Establish a framework for regular consultation with TFPs to coordinate interventions and monitor commitments and achievements
**TABLE A.6: Risks Related to Monitoring, Evaluation, and Control**

| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                 | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge                                      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Inadequate system for the monitoring and evaluation of sectoral activities and the PSMN overall | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Establish a common results framework and an information and knowledge management system        | 2           | 2        | 2      | 4                    | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries, TFPs                |
|                                                                       |          |        |                     | • Develop and deploy a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan                                |             |          |        |                      |                                                       |
|                                                                       |          |        |                     | • Strengthen stakeholder capacity for monitoring and evaluation                                   |             |          |        |                      |                                                       |
| Inadequate financial monitoring, control, and audit system             | 2        | 2      | 4                   | • Strengthen financial management and control capacities                                         | 2           | 1        | 2      | 2                    | CLM-BEN, MEFP, other ministries                       |
|                                                                       |          |        |                     | • Strengthen the support of CLM’s BEN in the management and control of projects                   |             |          |        |                      |                                                       |
|                                                                       |          |        |                     | • Promote the rapid deployment of IFIS in sectors most involved in the implementation of the PSMN|             |          |        |                      |                                                       |
| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                 | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Inadequate behavior change communication for target populations       | 2        | 3      | 6                   | • Develop and implement a communication and advocacy plan for the nutrition sector               | 3           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, other ministries      |
| Insufficient support for internal communication and change management needs of PSMN stakeholders | 3        | 2      | 6                   | • Strengthen internal communication between stakeholders in the nutrition sector                  | 3           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, other ministries      |
| Poor communication of PSMN results                                   | 2        | 2      | 4                   | • Develop and implement a communication and advocacy plan for the nutrition sector               | 3           | 2        | 2      | 4                   | CLM-BEN, other ministries      |
### Table A.8: Strategic Risks Related to Implementation of the PSMN

| Risks                                                                 | Exposure | Impact | Initial criticality | Recommended mitigating measures                                                                 | Feasibility | Exposure | Impact | Residual criticality | Entity in charge               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Deterioration of political, economic, social, or climatic conditions | 3        | 3      | 9                   | • Coordinate management of exceptional risks with food security agencies<br>• Promote climate risk insurance<br>• Promote the development of off-season farming<br>• Diversify production and promote local products and processing | 1           | 3        | 3      | 9        | CLM-BEN, CNSA, other ministries |
## APPENDIX B

### List of Interviewees

| Organization | Full Name                  | Email                        |
|--------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| CLM          | Dr. Ndéye Khady TOURE      | nndiaye@clm.sn               |
|              | Malick FAYE                | mfyaye@clm.sn                |
|              | Aminata NDOYE              | andoye@clm.sn                |
|              | Abdoulaye KA               | aka@clm.sn                   |
|              | Momar THIAM                | mthiam@clm.sn                |
|              | **Agence Nationale de la Petite Enfance et de la Case des Tout-Petits (ANPECTP)** |                             |
|              | Sophie SOW GUEYE           | sagessesow60@yahoo.com       |
|              | Karo DIAGNE NDAW           | karodiagne@gmail.com         |
|              | Jean pape FAYE             | jeanjapestar@gmail.com       |
|              | Jules SAMBOU               | jules.sambou@gmail.com       |
|              | Cheikh NDOUR               | ndourcheikh@yahoo.com        |
|              | Alassane DIEDHIOU           | alassanediedhiou@yahoo.fr    |
|              | **USAID-Yaajeende**        |                              |
|              | Karl ROSENBERG             | krosenberg@usaid-yaayjeende.org |
|              | Papa Sène DIERY            | psene@usaid-yaayjeende.org   |
|              | Dr Nafissatou LO           |                              |
|              | **REACH/WFP**              |                              |
|              | Sophie Cowppli-BONY        | sophie.cowpplibi@wfp.org     |
|              | Dr Aida GADIAGA            | aida.gadiaga@wfp.org         |
|              | **FAO**                    |                              |
|              | Komlan KWAJODÉ             | komlan.kwajode@fao.org       |
|              | Christophe BREYNE          | christophe.breyne@fao.org    |
|              | **BACDI**                  |                              |
|              | Aminata Ndiaye COLY        | aminata74@yahoo.fr           |
|              | **Ministry of Finance, the Economy and Planning (MEFP)** |   |
|              | Dr. Louise HABIB SECK      | lshabib64@yahoo.fr           |
|              | **Ministry of Health and Social Action (MSAS)** |      |
|              | Dr. Maty DIAGNE CAMARA     | matydiagne@yahoo.com         |
|              | **Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Infrastructure (MAER)** |   |
|              | Seynabou MBOPU             | naboumoucheikh@gmail.com     |
|              | Fatou G. GUEYE             | fagueye20032003@yahoo.fr     |
6. In economic planning in Senegal, ministries develop sectoral policy letters reflecting the development strategy in their sectors and serving to guide investments, the implementation of projects and programs, and their monitoring and evaluation. In interviews with ministries, including the Ministry of Finance, we noted that the risk was lower in aligning overall sectoral policies with the objectives of nutrition policy, but more important in the choice of actual priorities in the case of insufficient budgetary resources (as is very often the case).

7. These investment opportunities could be combined with incentives to support private sector food enrichment efforts.

8. One example is an ongoing project with MSAS.
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