

NS AIM TWG and SAG MEETING

NS Coordination (In person/Virtual) | 15 June 2025 | 03:00 AM– 05:00 PM



Meeting Minute

Chair: Kibrom Tesfaselassie, NS Coordinator

Note taker: Suparna Das Toma, UNV Nutrition Officer, NS

Participants: ISCG, ACF, Concern, GK, SCI, SHED, UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP. See Annex 1 for detailed participant list.

Agenda

1. To address further queries related to SENS 2024.
2. Revision of the PIN and Target for 2025 and forecast caseload for 2026

Welcome and Introduction

Kibrom Tesfaselassie welcomed all the participants to the Nutrition Sector AIM TWG and SAG meeting on 15 June 2025. Representatives from all the members and ISCG were presented in the meeting. Following a brief introduction, the meeting was started.

1. Queries on SENS 2024.

- NS provided short background of the meeting objective to the participants. NS attended a CXB head of UN agencies (UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP) meeting on SENS 2024, organized by the ISCG team. Health and Food Security Coordinator were also part of the discussion. Following an in-depth discussion, participants agreed that further consultations should take place within the Nutrition Sector TWG and SAG to address key concerns/queries (see below bullet points) and to reconsider the validation of SENS 2024. To support the process and enable ISCG to brief senior management on the survey findings and suggested way forward, the meeting was arranged involving AIM TWG, NS SAG members and ISCG. See the queries below in box.

1. Given the normality of variations between team findings and overall finding that the SENS 2024 data quality was “good”, why should this invalidate SENS 2024? Why can't these variations be taken into account, and the results shared showing the range of findings, for example with and without the data from teams 3 and 5?
2. If part of the SENS 2024 findings is considered so “problematic” that it can't be validated from a technical perspective, can other parts of the SENS survey be used? Given the amount of data collected and money invested on the survey we should validate and use as much of the analysis as we can rather than writing off the entire survey, while providing any necessary explanations/caveats and complementary analysis.
3. What other data is available from 2024/25 to provide an up-to-date picture of malnutrition in the camps, ideally differentiating new arrivals from the registered population as there may be important differences? How (and by when) would the Sector recommend concluding the analysis of nutrition in 2024 to inform advocacy and programming in 2025/26?
4. Bearing in mind the good level of funding for Food Security and Nutrition in 2024, compared with the difficult funding situation in 2025, what would the Sector's key messages be in terms of managing malnutrition in the camps? What lessons can be drawn from past programming and what improvements can be made to further improve nutrition levels amongst refugees, given the imperative to adapt the response and improve cost-efficiency?

- AIM TWG briefly presented the finding of the validation of exercise to the participants as a refresher where the following key points were highlighted-

- ✓ The overall quality of the SENS 2024 data was good. However, data quality checks conducted by team revealed issues, particularly with Teams 3 and 5, which impacted both data consistency and reliability. Teams 3 and 5 had the highest problematic scores of 35 and 27, respectively.
- ✓ Kurtosis analysis indicated that data from a few teams showed negative values, which may suggest issues with distribution shape or data has been over cleaned. For team 6, the kurtosis value was problematic.
- ✓ As per the SMART Manual, there is a defined relationship between moderate and severe wasting based on the level of malnutrition in the community. The MAM/SAM ratio in SENS 2024 was 15.6, which deviates from the standard ratio of 21.4. Ideally, this ratio should be above 20.
- ✓ There were three missing values, but the explanations provided were not satisfactory. Based on available measurements of these children, they were underweight and stunted and may also be wasted if full measurements were taken during the period of survey. In some cases (five), children's weights were not adjusted for additional clothing, and height and length measurements were interchanged inappropriately.
- ✓ There were 10 cases where children were identified as severely stunted and severely underweight, yet their wasting status indicated they were well-nourished as per dataset. The measurements of these children should have been rechecked, but this was not done during the survey period for confirmation of actual status.
- ✓ A significant concern was the notable variation in GAM prevalence, especially for Teams 5 and 6.
- ✓ There was also a lack of rigorous daily data cross-checking, which may have contributed to these inconsistencies. Implementing rigorous daily data cross-checking by the survey manager could have helped identify and address issues early, leading to improved overall data quality.
- ✓ Previous SENS /SMART surveys conducted between November and December, similar to 2024, indicating that seasonal variability is unlikely to explain the observed discrepancies.
- Based on the above queries, UNHCR inquired whether the data from problematic teams could be excluded from the analysis to validate the survey. AIM TWG responded that removing these teams would make the results non-representative of the target population. Additionally, since the problematic teams reported lower GAM prevalence, their exclusion would introduce bias, which is both methodologically and ethically unacceptable. Food Security Coordinator is also in full agreement with this justification provided by the TWG.
- Participants involved in in-depth discussion on the findings from the validation exercise and concluded that NS will not use the anthropometry and IYCF data models from SENS 2024.
- The ISCG FSS Coordinator noted that SENS 2024 includes data modules beyond anthropometry and IYCF which is household level module. AIM TWG was asked whether these additional modules were evaluated during the validation process. AIM TWG clarified that, since the NS is primarily focused on anthropometry and IYCF and the inclusion of other modules in the validation process had not been previously discussed, so those modules were not reviewed. From the very beginning, the Nutrition Sector (NS) has made it clear that if the TWG does not validate the core indicators, it will not be in a position to validate or publish the survey results partially. Even the validation of other modules of the survey mainly the caregiver's perception does have additional value. In this context, NS has brought the matter to the TWG's attention today 15 June 2025. However, these additional models can now be brought forward for discussion within the AIM TWG. Thus, NS has now requested UNHCR to share data from the other modules with AIM TWG for further evaluation. AIM

TWG highlighted that AIM TWG only reviews and validates core nutrition indicators, such as anthropometry. AIM has not been involved in the comprehensive review of other sectoral modules/indicators in the previous survey.

- NS will address the next two queries #3 and #4 in consultation with AIM TWG.

2. Revision of the PIN and Target for 2025 and forecast caseload for 2026

NS requested AIM TWG members to meet on 16 June 2025 at 9:30 AM to review and revise the PIN and targets for 2025.

Action points:

Action point	Focal point	Timeline	Remark
To share data from the other modules with AIM TWG for further evaluation.	UNHCR	ASAP	As discussed in AIM TWG meeting on 16 June 2025, AIM TWG will not participate in reviewing the remaining SENS 2024 modules, as the remaining module require sector specific technical review and AIM TWG does not have parameters for validating respondent based or recall based data.
To review and revise the PIN and targets for 2025.	AIM TWG	16 June 2025	

Annex 1: List of Participants

In person:

Name	Organization	Email
Shahana Hayat	Concern	shahana.hayat@concern.net
Md. Ariful Kabir Sujon	GK	nutri_coord@gkcox.org
David Bugden	ISCG	david@iscgcb.org
Naser MOHMAND	ISCG	naser.mohmand@wfp.org
Sadia Islam	SCI	sadia.islam@savethechildren.org
Md. Fahimuzzaman	SHED	fahim@shedbd.org
Vincent Kahi	UNHCR	kahivi@unhcr.org
Mohammad Zahidul Manir	UNICEF	mmanir@unicef.org
Md. Lalan Miah	UNICEF	mlmiah@unicef.org
Pauline AKABWAI	WFP	pauline.akabwai@wfp.org
Mohammad ASHIKULLA	WFP	mohammad.ashikulla@wfp.org
Kibrom Tesfaselassie	NS	ktesfaselassie@unicef.org
Mohd. Mostakim Ali	NS	mmoali@unicef.org
Suparna Das Toma	NS	stoma@unicef.org

Online:

Name	Organization	Email
Dr. Md. Abul Hasan	ACF	nuthod@bd-actionagainsthunger.org
Deepika Sharma	UNICEF	desharma@unicef.org
Anjuman Tahmina Ferdous	UNICEF	aferdous@unicef.org
Siti HALATI	WFP	siti.halati@wfp.org

//////////////////// THE END //////////////////////

For more information: [Nutrition Sector \(NS\)](#)

Website: <https://rohingyaresponse.org/sectors/coxs-bazar/nutrition/>

