**Nutrition Subgroup Teleconference**  
July 2, 2015 at 9am EST  
**Participants:** Anna and Dyness (MCSP), Maddie, Meghan (MDG Health Alliance), Jerome (UNICEF), Dolores (UNICEF), Jennifer (ICF), Ivy (1mCHW), Amelia (IMC), Casie, Saul and Helen (ACF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Review of Action Points from last call (below) | • Saul & Dolores to review the Action Plan once all input has been received ahead of the next call  
• Saul to follow up with CORE Group: call will hopefully happen in the next couple weeks  
• Casie proposed alternative formulation of the CHW and quality of care question | • Saul to reach out to CORE Group to define ways of working |
| Review of major structural changes in the action plan (approve) | • In the most recent iteration, the co-chairs merged the results and activities in a way that they could be feasibly achieved.  
• Objective 1: Map out where nutrition iCCM is being done around the world. How we can do this, how we can arrive at this point? Are we going to commission an independent study? In theory, all the integrated iCCM programs should have nutrition, but we know this is not the reality. We need to find out why this isn’t happening in some countries.  
• Would be valuable to build upon in country team support, but it would need to be comprehensive questions (not a yes or no question).  
• Upcoming iCCM symposium: Jerome attended a preparatory meeting discussing timelines -- aiming for early/mid-2017. We will have a little more time to complete mapping work of subgroup.  
• OR Subgroup did an analysis of the UNICEF survey. Most of countries said they were doing nutrition, but you really cannot tell what they are doing when you look at the details and delve further.  
• WHO did a survey and mapping of iCCM in fragile states. What activities are supported in country? Activities should be broken down further if we are to include another question in a UNICEF survey. Need more consistency so we can solicit the same information from different countries.  
• We should develop a “harmonized” mapping survey with the other working groups to not duplicate efforts. We need to be in agreement | • Saul will circulate a proposed way for people to input plans for dividing up objectives and tasks, and a way to prioritize in terms of chronology.  
• If anyone has any connections with research partners to join the group that would be very helpful. |
about the kinds of questions we will ask. Surveys will need a group overview.

- **Objective 2:** Proposal on evaluating the impact of integrated nutrition and iCCM. Research questions. Something to consider the second revision of the Action Plan. Would be easy to divide into study questions and then prioritize. Organizations should be responsible for leading different activities, making it more manageable.
- We need to define better what we are looking for, prioritize and cluster some of those questions.
- Would be better to keep it within the group to maintain priorities.
- WHO CHINRI study on integration would be helpful.
- Work with in-country people to find out if our priorities align with those at the country level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discuss proposal for concurrent London and NY meetings</th>
<th>Would be helpful to organize face-to-face meetings for the teleconference. Most are in New York, London.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss how to loop other iCCM/Nutrition conversations at country level with the Subgroup</td>
<td>Find out which groups in Kenya are doing work around iCCM and nutrition. Also, in Mali, including representatives from the government. Should we invite in-country reps to join these calls? Participation isn’t always regular but these calls are already very large. Perhaps having a point person for each country to be a representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss possible face-to-face meeting at country level</td>
<td>Should this been done North (HQs) or South (in countries where CCM is happening). Weigh the pros and cons. We should discuss this in countries where it is most relevant. Also, would be valuable to figure out which country doesn’t have strict visa applications. Objective of the meeting would be valuable to overlap with presentation of findings and next steps. What are the pros and cons of having this as a standalone conversation versus as an integrated view? Can discuss further at next call.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Saul and Dolores to explore the potential for concurrent face-to-face groups in NY and London for the next call.
- If you are based in DC, reach out to Anna Bryant to join an in-person call.
- Saul and Dolores to discuss options for connecting with country level discussions. To be presented and discussed for the next call.
- Work with Jerome and Dolores on where this might be possible.