I-CAN POLICY BRIEF: STRENGTHENING CLIMATE-NUTRITION INTEGRATION IN SOMALIA

A concise brief for decision-makers based on the I-CAN landscaping analysis of Somalia policies and stakeholders

Emily Addonizio, Mohamednur Keynan, Francesco Riedo, Oliver Camp, Antony Ogolla, Ninon Alaniou

Key message: Somalia has strong policy intent and several system building blocks, but the next step is operational integration - clear mandates, one workplan, aligned financing, shared indicators and practical pilots through existing platforms.

Executive Summary

Somalia has a growing policy architecture for climate resilience, food systems, nutrition, health, social protection, and disaster risk management. The I-CAN landscaping analysis finds that this architecture provides a credible foundation for integrated action, but that integration remains uneven and not yet consistently operationalised.

The assessment reviewed 38 documents, including 25 policies and strategies, and triangulated the review with stakeholder consultations, Key Informant Interview (KII) responses, and a validation workshop in Mogadishu. The analysis shows that selected frameworks—especially the Somalia Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy 2026-2030, the Somalia Nutrition Cluster Strategy 2026-2030 and the Health National Adaptation Plan—contain stronger provisions for climate-nutrition integration. However, many climate, food security, agriculture, health, and social protection frameworks only acknowledge the connections between climate change and nutrition—stopping short of taking meaningful action to address both as an integrated agenda.

The central message is practical: Somalia does not need to create parallel structures. It needs to connect, finance, monitor, and hold accountable the structures it already has. Priority actions include clarifying coordination mandates, defining one shared implementation workplan, developing a small set of climate-nutrition indicators, mapping and aligning financing flows, and piloting integrated delivery through existing platforms such as school feeding, social protection, health and nutrition services, agricultural extension, and early warning systems.

INTRODUCTION

Somalia faces overlapping climate, food security and nutrition pressures. Recurrent droughts, floods and environmental degradation affect food systems, livelihoods, access to services and household resilience. These shocks interact with existing drivers of malnutrition, including poverty, displacement, prolonged conflict (and associated economic fragility), disease burden, market disruption, limited access to safe water, and uneven service delivery. Failed rains and a prolonged dry season in 2025 have led to a drought emergency with extreme impacts on production and livelihoods.

The relevance of climate-nutrition integration is therefore immediate. Climate shocks influence the systems that determine nutrition outcomes: food availability and access, water security, health service delivery, disease risk, household income and care practices. At the same time, nutrition outcomes influence resilience, human capital and the ability of households and communities to recover from shocks.

The policy landscape reviewed for the assessment includes national frameworks on climate, nutrition, food security, agriculture, health, WASH, social protection, disaster risk management, school feeding and food systems. Key institutions include the Office of the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Planning, Investment and Economic Development, Federal Member States, the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN) Secretariat, coordination clusters, UN agencies, development partners, civil society actors and private-sector stakeholders.

METHODOLOGY

The brief draws on a qualitative policy landscape assessment applying the I-CAN Baseline Assessment Framework. Documents were reviewed against six analytical components: problem framing, policy intent, actions, institutions and coordination, financing, and monitoring/accountability. The analysis covered an eight-week period from March to April 2026 and focused on formally documented national and sectoral frameworks.

The analysis was guided by five evaluation questions covering the extent of integration, quality of operationalisation, coordination, financing, and monitoring/accountability. It also tested three hypotheses: the depth of nutrition metrics in climate frameworks; the gap between conceptual and operational integration; and the presence of practical entry points for integrated action.

Document coding was triangulated with evidence from questionnaires and interviews. Twenty-four stakeholders were identified across government, Federal Member States, UN agencies, development partners, civil society, coordination platforms, and academia. Twenty-one responses were completed. A validation workshop in Mogadishu on 20 April 2026 brought together 20 participants to obtain feedback on preliminary findings.

KEY RESULTS / FINDINGS

1. Integration exists, but remains uneven across sectors

Somalia's policy landscape recognises the climate-nutrition nexus, especially in relation to food systems, vulnerability, resilience, livelihoods and health risks. Climate-related frameworks such as NDC 3.0, the National Adaptation Plan and the National Climate Change Policy acknowledge food systems and vulnerability, but do not consistently define nutrition outcomes such as dietary diversity or malnutrition reduction as explicit objectives linked to actions, financing and accountability.

The strongest documented integration appears in frameworks that combine climate or shock responsiveness with nutrition programming and monitoring. The Somalia Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy and Somalia Nutrition Cluster Strategy provide important examples of stronger policy design. However, the evidence indicates stronger documented integration; it is not proof that integrated implementation is occurring consistently across the system.

2. Coordination platforms exist, but joint implementation remains weak

The assessment identifies many coordination structures, including the SUN Secretariat, nutrition and food security clusters, technical working groups and federal member state-level platforms. These mechanisms create entry points for joint planning and alignment.

However, KII and validation evidence point to unclear mandates, leadership overlaps, limited follow-up, weak resourcing and uneven state-level coordination. The main issue is not the absence of platforms, but the limited ability of those platforms to drive shared workplans, joint budgeting and accountability across sectors.

3. Financing is fragmented and donor-dependent

Several policies include financing provisions, and the stronger nutrition frameworks contain costed plans, budget lines, or financing options. Yet stakeholder evidence shows that integrated climate-nutrition financing remains underdeveloped. Domestic allocations are limited, donor reliance is high, and funding flows are often fragmented by project or sector.

This financing pattern makes it difficult to sustain integrated action. The assessment points to the need for a pooled or better-aligned financing mechanism linked to one national priority plan and transparent expenditure tracking.

4. Data and monitoring systems are not yet integrated

Monitoring provisions exist in several strategies, including MEL or MEAL frameworks, annual reviews, scorecards and indicator tables. However, data systems remain largely sector-specific. Climate, agriculture, food security, health, WASH, social protection and nutrition data are not consistently connected or used for joint decision-making.

The immediate priority is a small, feasible set of shared climate-nutrition indicators that can be used in coordination meetings, budget reviews and annual performance assessments. The problem is not absence of monitoring architecture, but absence of integrated climate-nutrition accountability.

5. Existing programmes offer practical entry points

The assessment identifies functioning but fragmented system building blocks, including costed nutrition planning, coordination platforms, social protection and school feeding systems, health and nutrition services, agricultural extension, early warning and risk monitoring tools. Programmes such as Baxnaano, Damal Caafimaad and the Food Security and Resilience Programme can provide entry points, but should be treated as building blocks rather than already fully integrated climate-nutrition models.

The policy opportunity is to use existing platforms to test integrated planning, financing, service delivery and monitoring before scaling nationally.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Short-term priorities (0-12 months)		Medium-term priorities (1-3 years)	
1	Clarify mandates and decision rights for climate-nutrition coordination across the Office of the Prime Minister, line ministries, Federal Member States and technical platforms.	6	Formalise cross-sector implementation frameworks that translate policy intent into joint planning, budgets, roles and reporting routines.
2	Define one practical implementation workplan with a limited number of national priorities, clear responsibilities, and regular follow-up.	7	Develop a pooled or better-aligned financing mechanism linked to a national priority plan and transparent expenditure tracking.
3	Develop a small set of shared climate-nutrition indicators linked to existing data sources and decision-making processes.	8	Scale integrated delivery models across health, agriculture, social protection, WASH, education and food systems where pilots demonstrate feasibility.
4	Map funding flows across nutrition, climate, food security, social protection, health and agriculture to identify gaps, overlaps and opportunities for alignment.	9	Strengthen sub-national capacity for planning, coordination, financial management, monitoring and integrated programming in Federal Member States and districts.
5	Pilot integrated delivery through existing platforms such as school feeding, social protection, agricultural extension, health and nutrition services, and early warning systems.	10	Institutionalise stakeholder engagement by involving local NGOs, community structures, private-sector actors and value-chain stakeholders in implementation planning and monitoring.

Implementation considerations: Actions should be anchored in existing national leadership, aligned with federal member state implementation capacity, and connected to financing and monitoring systems.

Governance, financing, capacity strengthening, and monitoring should be treated as a single implementation package rather than as separate workstreams.

ROADMAP FOR ACTION

The report's roadmap matters because it gives time-bound structure to the recommendations. Even a concise brief needs to preserve that sequencing so the recommendations do not read like a flat wish list.

Phase	Timing	What matters most
Phase 1	0-12 months	Review mandates and leadership roles, define shared indicators, map funding flows, and launch pilots through school feeding and social protection.
Phase 2	1-3 years	Formalise cross-sector implementation frameworks, operationalise financing, expand integrated delivery, and build sub-national capacity.
Phase 3	3-5 years	Institutionalise joint monitoring, increase domestic financing, embed climate risk in planning cycles, and scale nutrition-sensitive food-system measures.

CONCLUSION

Key findings from the analysis include that integration is more visible in policy framing than in operational systems; coordination, financing, and monitoring remain fragmented; and practical entry points already exist through active but under-connected policies and programmes. The core message is therefore not that Somalia needs a wholly new architecture, but that it needs stronger links between the structures already in place. If those links are strengthened through clearer governance, better-aligned financing, shared monitoring, and phased implementation, Somalia can move from partial alignment toward more resilient and accountable climate-nutrition governance.