

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Name of Country

2016 Reporting Template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platform

April 2015 to April 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016¹ were compiled from stakeholders, and to what extent the process was useful to in-country stakeholders, please provide us with the following details:

Participation

1. Did the following stakeholder groups provide specific inputs, whether in writing or verbally, to the Joint-Assessment?

Group	Yes / No (= 0)
Government	Yes , 28 participants
Civil Society	Yes , 12 participants
Science and Academia	Yes , 3 participants
Donors and United Nations	Yes , 6 participants
Business	Yes , 13 participants
Other (please specify)	

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? 62 participants

¹ Please note that the analysed results of this Joint-Assessment exercise will be included in the SUN Movement Annual Progress Report 2016 along with the details of how the exercise was undertaken in- country.

Process

3. Was the Joint-Assessment data gathered and/or reviewed during a face-to-face meeting, or via email?

Step	Format			
Collection	Meeting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>
Review, validation	Meeting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, please attach a photo of it if possible [as attached]

Usefulness

5. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, would you say that the meeting was useful to participants, beyond the usual work of the MSP?

Yes / ~~No~~

Why?

Yes, the meeting was very useful, it enabled us to monitor the progress of SUN Movement coordination jointly with all the network in a participatory way.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/ Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

Strengthened coordinating mechanisms at national and sub-national level enable in-country stakeholders to better work for improved nutrition outcomes. Functioning multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral platforms enable the delivery of joint results, through facilitated interactions on nutrition related issues, among sector relevant stakeholders. Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms (MSP) enable the mobilisation and engagement of relevant stakeholders, assist relevant national bodies in their decision making, enable consensus around joint interests and recommendations and foster dialogue at the local level.

Progress marker 1.1: Select / develop coordinating mechanisms at country level

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordination mechanisms are established at government level and are regularly convened by high-level officials. It indicates if non-state constituencies such as the UN Agencies, donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement) ▪ Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator ▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis ▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative 	4	Structure is in place as per Government Regulation No 42/2013 which mandated Deputy Minister for Human Development, Society, and Cultural Affair as chairperson of technical team which also as SUN focal point for Indonesia . UNICEF was appointed as UN/donor convener in 2014 [1.1. letter from Coordinating Minister for Human Development and Cultural Affair]; DFAT was appointed by Donor and UN Country Network on Nutrition (DUNCNN) members as Co-Lead

<p>with convening and coordinating functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure ▪ Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested] 		<p>DUNCNN was established in December 2014 and is under Partnership Task Force. The DUNCNN has met 6 times (once every two months) in the last 12 months. Indofood acted as lead for Sun Business Network (SBN) Indonesia, established in September 10th 2015. SUN Indonesia Civil Society Alliance (CSA) established in 2013, and holds a regular meeting every two months. [1.1. Networks TOR].</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board ▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors ▪ Actively engage executive level political leadership ▪ Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics ▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc ▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally, and create a feedback loop between the central and local levels, including community, and vulnerable groups. [Provide examples, if available] 	<p>3</p>	<p>Ministries, Departements, Agencies (MDAs) involved in the MSP increased from 13 MDAs to 18 technical ministries and 3 Coordinating Ministries (additional : coordinating ministry of human development and Cultural affair, coordinating ministry of Economic, and Coordinating Ministry for Maritime affair). The technical ministries includes strong engagement from Ministry of public Works who is responsible for Water and Sanitation Hygiene (WASH).</p> <p>The challenge is to separate NGO and academia/professional organization which, at global level, are in the SUN Civil Society network. Discussion has been made to separate those two into two different networks.</p> <p>[1.2 RAN-PG 2015-2019]</p>

Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans ▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. ▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders ▪ Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues ▪ Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies ▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	<p>3</p>	<p>In the Food and Nutrition Action Plan, all line ministries are monitored in their target achievement, and on the budget allocation for nutrition.</p> <p>Private sectors and CSO has no monitoring system related to monitor their contribution (against agreed work-plans).</p> <p>In addition, government and Donor and UN Networks has developed financial tracking and reporting tool to be reported to the secretariat.</p>

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [Supporting documents requested from the latest reporting cycle] ▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum e.g. financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc. 	<p>2</p>	<p>Secretariat has no special website to report all activities and routine Publication. All information is available in each line ministries and organization.</p> <p>Report of N4G and Financial commitments has been developed and has been shared to all stakeholders.</p> <p>[1.4. Report of Deputy Minister in SUN Meeting - reporting of SUN ; Report of SBN; Report of DUNCNN; 1.5. Report of CSA]</p>
Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups 	<p>3</p>	<p>Nutrition Development had been included as priority program in the Annual Work Plan 2017.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
<p>Government</p>	<p>Advocacy and Communications of 1000 HPK had been conducted very well by the government, however Cross-sector coordination is still challenging, both in term of frequency of official meeting and unofficial Communications through email, Networks, or Home. Moreover, we need to improve the coordination at sub-national level as tight as at National level.</p>

<p>UN and Donor</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DUNCNN invited to present progress at Partnership Task Force meeting, October 2015. 2. DUNCCN has a ToR and annual list of priority issues. 3. Invitation letters sent in 2015 to donors and UN agencies to join the DUNCCN. Membership peaked in July 2015 with the following members that include 14 development agencies working on nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive sectors: UNICEF, DFAT, MCA-I/MCC, USAID, FAO, WFP, WHO, IFAD, ILO, WB, GIZ, Netherlands, DFATD, ADB. Of these 14 development agencies, 2 were new since April 2015. 4. DUNCNN members collectively work across several sectors, including health, education, WASH, agriculture, food security, social protection and others. 5. There is a UN/NGO group on nutrition in NTT 6. Global UN Network meeting was conducted in June 2015, in which UN members of the DUNCNN. In the last 12 months, there has been one meeting of the partnership working group, which DUNCNN members attended (October 2015). 7. DUNCNN has developed a financial tracking tool to report on commitments and expenditure on nutrition on an annual basis (2016) 8. Nutrition is firmly anchored in the UN Partnership Development Framework (UNPDF) with the government. Several DUNCNN members have also developed agency-specific country strategies or programmes that included nutrition as a key priority 9. DUNCNN Members involves in Modernizing Indonesia's Food System Toward 2030, technical support to be form on food safety system regulatory analysis and support to Zero Hunger Challenge and Rice Initiative
<p>Business</p>	<p>Indofood acted as a host for SBN Indonesia establishment in September 10th 2015 and several network meeting including SBN Asia December 3rd-4th 2015</p>
<p>CSO</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the National level, membership of CSA had been expanded to include interfaith Organisation, universities, and profesional organisation; 2. CSA have expanded the Networks to the sub-national level; 3. There is a forum to share the best practices (capacity Building to all members and sharing); 4. Generating evidence, advocacy and Communications from academia is already massive, therefore universities conducted many research related to nutrition. 5. CSO coordinated the First 1000 Days of Life theme to interfaith Organisation Networks and society. 6. Involving religius leaders to communicate the movement to the society 7. Building the Board of Education, health, and Social. 8. Conduct pre-service training for nutritionist.
<p>Others</p>	<p>-</p>

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

- Indonesia’s Presidential Decree No. 42/2013 on National Movement to Accelerate Nutrition Improvement within the Framework of the ‘First 1,000 Days of Life Movement’ led to the establishment of a multi-stakeholder high-level Task Force under the Coordinating Minister of Human Development and Cultural Affair. The Presidential decree No. 2 / 2015 had been issued on the National Medium Term Development Plan 2015-2019, consisting nutrition Development plan across relevant ministries. In addition, Government Regulation No. 17 / 2015 on Food and Nutrition Security is strengthening the National Action plan on Food and nutrition (RAN-PG 2015-2019).
- Advocacy strategy which had been implemented through several Activities with objectives to improve ministries commitments on the nutrition improvement in RPJMN, RAN-PG, as well as annual workplan 2017, illustrates that advocacy Activities are increased and stronger.
- SBN members are also expanded to the Corporate beyond Food and beverages companies, such as : Kalbe, Pharos, Merck, BNI, Astra International).

Challenges are as follows:

1. Website development to address the knowledge sharing challenges on the progress of the movement
2. Improve coordination among CSO and other Networks
3. Advocacy to Private sectors beyond Food and beverages industry

Recommendation : Enhance the regular advocacy on policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews, particularly on costing. Convene in routine meeting, not only within the internal network but also Cross Networks, are expected 3-4 times per year. Engage Closely with academia and profesional Organisation. The SUN Secretariat needs to be strengthened to ensure that MSP coordination can be held routinely not only at the national level but also sub-national level.

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring / Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

The existence of a coherent policy and legal framework should inform and guide how in-country stakeholders work together for improved nutrition outcomes. Updated policies, strategies and legislations are fundamental to prevent conflicts of interest among the wide range of actors involved in a complex societal topic such as nutrition. This process focuses on the enabling policy and legal environment.

Progress marker 2.1: Continuously analyse existing nutrition-relevant policies and legislations

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations ▪ Reflect on existing policies and legal framework ▪ Existence of review papers ▪ Indicate any nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</p>	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GoI with support from DUNCNN developed Background Paper on Nutrition (2014), as part of the Health Sector Review, which included a brief overview of. [2.1.a. Nutrition Review] 2. DUNCNN members have contributed to the review and revision of several policies, legislations and guidelines. This includes an analysis of Indonesia's current legislation to protect breastfeeding against the World Health Assembly's International Code (2016); reviews of legislation on salt iodization (2014) and wheat flour fortification (2014/5);

<p>that can inform and guide policy making.</p>			<p>3. The development of Conflict of Interest Guidelines for the SUN Movement (2016). [2.1.b. Conflict of Interest]</p>
<p>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of an updated or new policy and legal framework for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentary engagement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality ▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops ▪ Dissemination and communication of policy / legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences 	<p>3</p>	<p>Advocacy and Communications strategy had been developed and used by stakeholders at National and sub-national level. Several meeting in local level has involving local House of Representatives and the proposed budget had been approved.</p>

<p>It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower the most vulnerable and disadvantaged (children and women) through equity-based approaches.</p>	<p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p>		
---	--	--	--

Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders - government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners - coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies. ▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality. ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p>	3	<p>In the new Action plan (RAN-PG 2015-2019), GOI coordinate the policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries constitutes 18 MDAs including sensitive sectors. The strategic policy and Action plan on Food and Nutrition had been finalized and proposed to be a Presidential Decree.</p>
Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks			
<p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation 	3	<p>Several local regulations had been issued in line with the National regulation within Regional Action Plan on Food and Nutrition.</p>

<p>operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation [Please share any relevant reports/documents] <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</p>		<p>A regulation of Breast-Milk Substitutes is exist, but it needs the improvement of law enforcement. Meanwhile, there is no national board monitoring on this issue at the national level.</p>
<p>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document best practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. ▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>MoH conducted the nutritional status assessment which depicts the improvement of nutritional status. The result had been published.</p> <p>[2.5. Nutritional Status Assessment]</p> <p>GOI with support from MCA-I conducted Education, Information, and Communications formative study as the basis to develop nutrition campaign. Aside from that, there are study for “Gizi Tinggi Prestasi” campaign. There is no routine dissemination to Mutual learning but once there is an opportunity, every stakeholder Networks share the Activities and/or best practices.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
<p>Government</p>	<p>Indonesia has policies and regulations to support scaling up nutrition program which are National Medium Term Development Plan 2015-2016 and National Action Plan on Food and Nutrition 2015-2019 with multisectoral approach, involving 18 technical</p>

	ministries and 3 coordinating ministries. The implementation at sub-national level rolled out through the new Regional Action Plan on Food and Nutrition in 4 provinces, and need to be strengthened in the remaining 30 provinces.
UN Donor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DUNCNN members have provided technical assistance to develop guidelines on Conflict of Interest, and are currently advocating for the strengthening of legislation to protect breastfeeding. 2. DUNCNN is in the process of developing common narrative for its members 3. The workshop on the 2016 Lancet Breastfeeding Series in March 2016 and publication on the analysis on the "cost of not breastfeeding" in Indonesia was supported by academicians, NGO and UN stakeholders and used to advocate for strengthening of Indonesia's legislation to protect breastfeeding. 4. DUNCNN members provided technical support to develop the RAN-PG/KSRAN-PG 5. DUNCNN members have provided technical support to develop/update guidelines, including guidelines on iron supplementation, balanced nutrition, management of chronic emergency deficiency in pregnant women and others. 6. DUNCNN members have provided technical support to develop guidelines and training moduls for National School Meals programme (PROGAS/Program Gizi Anak Sekolah)
Business	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Actively participate in the COI documents development 2. Establish Policy for member partnership sesuai dengan guideline SUN Movement dan Gerakan nasional percepatan perbaikan gizi 3. Establish guidelines for nutritions workforce and brestfeeding policy in the workplace 4. Improvement of Medical Check Up & Body Composition Index to be proposed to all SBN Business.
CSO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nutrition issue had been implanted from adolescents, premarital (through premarital counseling facilitated by health workers) 2. There are guidebooks for future Bride and groom, consisting reproductive health and the First 1000 days of Life. 3. Monitor the potential of conflict of Interest in 1000 HPK 4. Established a coherence Link with CSO beyond nutrition , for example on the theme of Maternal mortality rate and infant mortality rate 5. Hearing with Governor of Jakarta on Local government regulation of breastfeeding rim, and partnership with Private setor 6. Several hearings with other local government and Indonesian Child Protection Commission on the Prevention of stunting and the First 1000 days of life
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 2: Coherent policy and legal framework (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

The fourth period of 5-year national action plan on food and nutrition (RAN-PG) has been finalised using a multi-sector approach with a close involvement of SUN movement Networks. There are role distribution for stakeholders involved in specific and sensitive intervention. as well as identification of each SUN network contribution. Indicators for sensitive interventions also had been determined so cross sector activities can be effectively implemented and monitored.

To prevent conflict of Interest, GOI have developed the guideline to prevent and manage conflict of Interest, involving all stakeholders in the movement. The final draft to be finalised by this year.

Challenges : commitment of local government on the First 1000 days of Life is need to be improved.

Recommendation: (a) conduct socialization for multi stakeholders at national level and local level through face-to-face meeting or Electronic communication; (b) conduct advocacy activities for private sectors, decision maker, Education institution, and nutrition expert; (c) Establishment of National Board of breastmilk substitute by MoH ; (d) The improvement of Monitoring of formula Milk promotion bit Food and Drug Regulation Agency.

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/ Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework (CRF – please see ANNEX 4 for the definition)

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to nutrition improvement demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, in particular women and children, benefit from an improved nutrition status. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions². The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed across different sectors of Governments and among key stakeholders through a negotiated process. The existence of agreed common results would enable stakeholders to make their actions more nutrition driven through increased coordination or integration. In practice, a CRF may result in a **set of documents that are recognised as a reference point** for all sectors and stakeholders that work together for scaling up nutrition impact.

Progress marker 3.1: Align existing actions around national nutrition targets/policies

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholder groups take stock of what exists and align their own plans and programming for nutrition to reflect the national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews ▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms ▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping 	3	<p>GoI developed Background Paper on Nutrition (2014), as part of the Health Sector Review, to inform the nutrition component of the RPJMN, as well as the Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas (FSVA).</p> <p>RAN-PG 2015-2019 consist of stakeholder and nutrition action mapping – who is doing</p>

² ‘Actions’ refers to interventions, programmes, services, campaigns and enacted legislation or specific policy. The 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition provides a set of evidence-based high-impact specific nutrition actions including the uptake of practices such as ‘exclusive breastfeeding for six months’

<p>across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		<p>what; however, the mapping of Activities and relevant actors in Indonesia area is not formulated yet. In addition, there is a policy to tackle equity issues through “nusantara sehat/ Healthy Nusantara” where the intervention conducted and health workers assignment are appointed referring the location category: Remote area, border line, and/or archipelago.</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups³ ▪ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender); cost estimates of included interventions; cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities 	3	<p>In RAN-PG 2015-2019, there are 16 outcomes indicator to be achieved in the end of 2019. The RAN-PG is agreed as CRF for improving human Resources quality, include: implementation Plan with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (who is doing what), cost estimates of included interventions. The Development of Monitoring and Evaluation framework has been developed by Bappenas and is expected to be final by June 2016. To assist local government in developing the Regional Action Plan, Bappenas formulated the guideline of Regional Action Plan Development. [3.2. RAN-PG 2015-2019]</p>

³ This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process1

<p>estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</p>		
<p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement the priority actions. This requires, on the one hand, a clear understanding of gaps in terms of delivery capacity and, on the other hand, a willingness from in-country and global stakeholders to mobilise their technical expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources ▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements ▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level ▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The Common result Framework is in line with the RPJMN 2015-2019. The Mid-term planning is derived into annual planning, namely annual government workplan (RKP). As one of the program, there is “Nusantara Sehat / Healthy Nusantara” which has capacity Building Activities to prepare all health workers including nutritionist. Healthy Nusantara is conducted, referring to the assessment of needs, tools, methods, and capacity Building mechanism.</p>

Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information System (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate the agreed indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance ▪ Existence of regular progress reports ▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits ▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance ▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</p>	3	<p>RAN-PG 2015-2019 expand from specific to sensitive intervention, including the monitoring and evaluation mechanism. GOI monitored all provinces in Action implementation once a year, not only the performance but also the allocation budget of nutrition related activities. Reflecting the achievement of target, budget in annual plan is adjusted.</p> <p>In the monitoring workshop, academia is usually invited to give feedback on the coverage or challenges faced by the local government.</p>
Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories 	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nutritional Status Assessment Study 2015 as a baseline and demonstrates the condition in districts level, had been disseminated. 2. Efficacy Studies on rice fortification Fe poor

	<p>of change and implementation progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of evaluation of implementation at scale that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. SBN Indonesia had advocated nutrition improvement efforts to be a priority in every member. 4. Hasanudin University in the eastern of Indonesia have a cohort study to evaluate the nutrition status; 5. CSO had a baseline Mid-term evaluation and also evaluated Infant and Young Child Feeding program.
--	--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RAN-PG 2015-2019 2. Draft of presidential decree on Strategic Policy and Action Plan on Food and Nutrition 2015-2019 3. Regional Action Plan on Food and Nutrition in several provinces had been finalized 4. Formulation guideline of Regional Action Plan on Food and Nutrition 5. Draft of Monitoring and Evaluation Guideline of Regional Action Plan on Food and Nutrition
UN Donor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The DUNCNN's resource tracking tool (2016) provides an overview of nutrition actions supported by donors and UN. 2. DUNCNN members supported a workshop on multisector programming in February 2015, which involved multiple stakeholders. 3. DUNCNN members provided technical support towards the development of the RAN-PG (2016-19), which later became the KSRAN-PG. 4. The DUNCNN members have compiled a list of documents/reports on surveys, studies, assessments, evaluations and operational research on nutrition (2016). 5. DUNCNN members provided support to GoI in developing Background Paper on Nutrition (2014), as part of the Health Sector Review, which advocates for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive Programme 6. DUNCNN Members provided technical support to improve the indicators and the methodology of SKPG (Food and Nutrition Surveillance System)

Business	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developed strategic document for synchronize the priority of government and Private sector 2. Develop & advocate working group within the networking 3. Regular meeting (3 times / year), Trading progres report 4. Since June 2014 collaborate with PDGKI and PDGMI to support programs in Pesantren: Enhancing nutrition awareness and healthy lifestyle 5. POSYANDU development, free medical services, Clean and Healthy Lifestyle program 6. Breast feeding Corner at the office and factories – provide a private space for mothers
CSO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitated the policy dialogue Cross stakeholder in National and International level 2. Conducting talkshow on the First 1000 days of Life in radio 3. Advocate the budget improvement at the local level 4. Develop a Training program which in line with the RAN-PG, colaborating with government 5. Develop the innovation to implement RAN-PG : 6. Inovasi dalam rangka implementasi RAN-PG: SMS Bunda (health information for pregnant Women); Mom Loves Me (MLM) - counseling classes for breast-feed with Multi-level marketing (MLM) approach (with Community Health Centre in Sidoarjo), 7. Emo-Demo Emotional Demonstration Session with Pregnant Women, and mobile - integrated service Post (Posyandu) 8. Promotion : campaign, breastfeeding fair, Social media, and Mass media 9. Homestead Food Production 10. CMAM: Community Management Acute Malnutrition in 6 sub-districts 11. WASH: in 8 villages in CMAM intervention area, with STBM support and improvement of clean Water access
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 3: Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan (aligned programming)

(i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

The fourth period of RAN-PG involved more than 18 MDAs, including specific and sensitive intervention as well as each stakeholder's activities roadmap, using a multi-sectoral approach based on RPJMN 2015-2019 that are focused on the first 1,000 days of life. RPJMN and annual government workplan is a guidance for National and local government to make Activities priority in the Action Plan. The progress of the implementation of action plans is monitored and evaluated although it is still applied only for government sectors. Several provinces had developed the net RAN-PG.

Recommendation : to monitor regional Action plan to be in line with RAN-PG in order to ensure the implementation is on track and to involving local NGO. Moreover, there are gaps in SUN knowledge of several stakeholders, so the campaign and Communications are needed to be more massive. The next steps are every stakeholder networks make priority which in line with road map in RAN-PG. Also, stakeholder at local level should be advocated on the Presidential decree of strategi policy and National Action plan on Food and nutrition.

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	Ongoing	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/ Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

Assessing the financial feasibility of national plans to implement actions for improved nutrition is essential to determine funding requirements. The latter is based on the capability to track planned and actual spending on nutrition across relevant government ministries and from external partners. The existence of plans with clearly costed actions helps government authorities and key stakeholders (e.g. UN, Donors, Business, Civil Society) to align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to provide inputs for costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways including conducting a review of current spending or an estimation of unit costs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions [please provide the relevant documentation] ▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation ▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation] <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Medium Term Development Plan 2015-2019 2. Annual government work Plan 3. Strategic plan of technical Ministries 4. Costed plan in RAN-PG 2015-2019 5. There is significant improvement on the various activities to scaling up nutrition in every stakeholder. The biggest Resources are from government, donor, and UN system; 6. Resources from academia had focused on nutrition research, notably on the First 1000 days of life since 2015.

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</p>	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GOI have budget tracking exercise 2014-2015 including specific-sensitive intervention; 2. There is an External audit by Indonesia Audit Board and internal audit by Financial and Development Supervisory Agency 3. Cost effectiveness study had been done in Family Hope program (conditional cash transfer program); 4. The information on the Activities documentation could be accessed through information management officer and documentation in every ministry. 5. Social audit : Public Complaint System had been completed. 6. The Financial Tracking of UN & donor is still on process.

Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps ▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p>	3	<p>Every year there are bilateral meetings between Bappenas and technical ministries to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps. The meetings are also the place where annual target and budget allocation are set for next year to ensure continuous investment in nutrition; One example of the Gols' commitment in nutrition is the increase budget for nutrition from 600 billion to 1 trillion in 2015-2016;</p> <p>Village fund in which nutrition should be advocated as key to improve human development indicator, has been transferred to each village in 2015</p>
Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments ▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities ▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder 	2	<p>The DUNCNN resource tracking tool provides details on programmes supported by donors and UN. MoH monitored quarterly the disbursement of donor's fund.</p>

	Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)		
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy ▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions ▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions ▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</p>	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Long Term Development Plan 2005-2025 2. National Medium Term Development Plan 2015-2019 3. The Indonesia's SUN Movement policy using a multi-sector platform approach has been accommodated in RANPG 2015-2019 with multisectoral approach. 4. Private sector already has sustainability program.

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is an increased budget of nutrition-related Activities in : Ministry of Health, Drug and Food Control, Agriculture, Public Works, National Population and Family Planning Agency, Women Empowerment and Child Protection, Education and Culture, Home Affairs, Social Affair, Religious Affair. 2. Financial Tracking 2014-2015 – specific and sensitive activities 3. Expenditure Tracking 2015

UN Donor	1. DUNCNN has a resource tracking tool that provides allocations and expenditure of DUNCNN members on nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions since 2014, the base year of the DUNCNN. Tool populated in May 2016, and will be updated every six months and reported to SUN Secretariat
Business	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct Resource mobilization <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sharing Best practice in nutrition programme b. Development of Toolkit (nutrition workforce policy; mother with breast feeding policy) 2. Financial tracking, ensure nutrition program investment sustainability, with proper financial allocation to deliver impactful results
CSO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training for advocacy and budgeting analysis 2. Budget allocation to finance the training of health workers has been allocated in each hospital 3. Support the Conditional Cash Transfer Programme (Family Hope Program) 4. The improvement of several local governments allocation for health and nutrition advocated by Forum Masyarakat Madani (Civil Society Forum). Civil Society Forum as a partner of GOI as well as a media for society. 5. Advocate to local House of Representatives to allocate budget for religious forum for nutrition in Brebes District
Others	

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

The budget allocation for nutrition-sensitive interventions carried out by, among others, the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of Religious Affairs, the National Population and Family Planning Board (BKKBN), the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Agency of Food and Drug Control (BPOM), the Ministry of Industry, the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries has increased each year. However, not all of the National budget is derived to districts, The budget allocation for nutrition in MoH improvement rose significantly from 800 billion in 2015 to 1 trillion in 2016. There is also an increasing trend of budget allocation for health in business networks

Government has undertaken financial tracking for nutrition sensitive and specific interventions in 13 ministries/agencies. The challenge is to analyse the gap between allocated budget and expenditure. In addition, to agree on the weighting for each activities is another challenge due to limited references.

Currently, there are 20% of SBN members who directly contribute to nutrition intervention (specific and sensitive). Therefore, it is important to track Private sector Investment in the SUN Movement.. Financial Tracking needs to be expanded to identify the budget at sub-national level and other Networks, except for the government. In the near future, we will advocate local government to allocate more budget on nutrition-related activities.

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.		Subandi Sardjoko	Deputy of Human Development, Society, and Cultural Affaid			Yes
2.		Dini Latief	PDGKI			
3.		Abdul Razak Thaha	Hasanudin University			
4.		Endang L Achadi	University of Indonesia			
5.		Galopong Sianturi	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
6.		Yuni Zalirami	Directorate of Community Nutrition	subditpmkg@yahoo.com		
7.		Paulina Hutapea	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
8.		Lina Marlina	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
9.		Rini Suhartiwi	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
10.		Sunarno	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
11.		Mursalim	Directorate of Community Nutrition			

12.	Nusli Imansyah	Training Center of Health Human Resource	nuslii.2011@gmail.com		
13.	Joko Prawoto	Directorate of Community Nutrition	djprawoto@gmail.com		
14.	Pratiwi Yuniarti M	Directorate of Food Product Stadarization	pratiwiyuniarti@gmail.com		
15.	Arum Atmawikarta	Secretariat SDS's	arumatmawikarta@yahoo.co.id		
16.	R. Giri W	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
17.	Dwi Agustianti	Directorate of Food Product Stadarization	subdit_spk@yahoo.com		
18.	Evi Fatimah	Directorate of Community Nutrition	subag.tu.gizi@gmail.com		
19.	Galis Remina	Directorate of Community Relations	galisremina@gmail.com		
20.	Yunani	Ministry of Agriculture	bidangkonsumsi@yahoo.com		
21.	Eko Prihastono	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
22.	Murni				
23.	Ria	National Institute of Health Research and Development			

24.	Fransisca Melinda	Ministry of Communication and Information	fran016@kominfo.go.id		
25.	Theresia Ronny Andayani	Directorate for Health and Public Nutrition	theresia.ronny@bappenas.go.id		
26.	Yoenelli	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
27.	Winitra RA	Directorat of Health Promotion			
28.	Rozy Atrial	Micronutrient Initiative Indonesia	rjafar@micronutrient.org		
29.	Wahdini Hakim	Save the children	wahdinihakim@savethechildren.org		
30.	Heince M	PELKESI	heincemangesa@gmail.com		
31.	Patricia N	Save the children	Patricia_norimarna@saethechildren.org		
32.	Nina Sardjunani	Secretariat SDG's	nina@bappenas.go.id		
33.	Rayendra	ACF	clo@id.missions-acf.org		
34.	Anggie Erma	Fatayat Nahdatul Ulama	ayufaras@yahoo.com		
35.	Lily Herlina	Aisyiyah Muhammadiyah	herlinahlily@yahoo.co.id		
36.	Maftuhah	Fatayat Nahdatul Ulama	Mahtuhah.upi@gmail.com		
37.	Medawati	PERDHAKE	ladysmedawati@gmail.com		
38.	Roch. Ratri Wandansari	GAPMMI	rwandansari@yahoo.com		

39.	dr. Benhard Sihombing	Otsuka			
40.	Adis Tjahyono	Otsuka			
41.	Vera	APPINIA			
42.	Susana	GAPMMI	susana@nutrifood.co.id		
43.	Iwan S. Handoko	Kalbe	ihandoko@gmail.com		
44.	Satria Seta W	Cargill	Satria_wardaja@cargill.com		
45.	Angelique	Nutrifood			
46.	Fendy Sutanto	Nutrifood	fendy.sutanto@nutrifood.co.id		
47.	Herda Pradsmadji	Kalbe Group	herda.pradsmadji@kalbe.co.id		
48.	Indrayana	Indofood	indrayana@indofood.co.id		
49.	Jessica Lukman	Indofood	jessica.lukman@indofood.co.id		
50.	Irawati Susalit	APPNIA	appnia@gmail.com		
51.	Lina Rospita	UNFAO	Lina.rospita@fao.org		
52.	Harriet Torlesse	UNICEF			
53.	Nikendarti GAndini	UNWFP			
54.	Ninik	UNICEF			

55.	Sugeng Eko	WHO			
56.	Ali Subandoro	World Bank			
57.	Marina	Directorate of Community Nutrition			
58.	Doddy Izwardi	Directorate of Community Nutrition	izwardydoddy@gmail.com		Yes
59.	Meida Octarina	Deputy Assistant for nutrition, maternal, and child health, and environmental health			
60.	Entos Zainal	Bappenas	entos.zainal@bappenas.go.id		Yes
61.	Inti Wikanestri	Bappenas	inti.wikanestri@bappenas.go.id		Yes
62.	Pratiwi Ayuningtyas	Bappenas	Sekretariat1000hpk@bappenas.go.id		Yes

Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	<p>How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met since the last Joint-Assessment? Please provide details of the meeting, where applicable, i.e., Technical committee meetings, inter-ministerial meetings, working groups meetings, etc.</p>	<p>We have met for 9 times from May 2015- April 2016</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inter-ministerial meetings : formulation of RAN PG 2015-2019 2. Technical committee meetings : Fortification Coordination 3. Kick off SUN Business Network
----	---	--

		<p>4. Working group meeting : Nutrition Campaign coordination</p> <p>5. Working group meeting : Campaign design</p> <p>6. Working group meeting : Network coordination</p> <p>7. Technical meeting : expanding the secretariat</p> <p>8. Technical meeting : revise the Presidential Decree No. 42 / 2013</p> <p>9. Working group meeting : Financial Tracking exercise</p>
1.	<p>Is your MSP replicated at the decentralised levels? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No)</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.</p>	<p>Yes, but not fully.</p> <p>The MSP has been replicated at the provincial level through Regional Action Plan on Food and Nutrition (RAD PG). Several districts have also started to formulate the Action Plan with multisectoral approach.</p>
2.	<p>Have you organised any high level event since the last Joint-Assessment? (Yes/No)</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details of the event organised, i.e., Forum on Nutrition, Workshop for high-level officials, etc.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Global Nutrition Report Roundtable Discussion – more than 300 participants attended from National and sup-national level, every stakeholder were invited.</p> <p>Lancet Breastfeeding Series Launch- more than 300 participants from different networks attended the event</p>
3.	<p>Are you planning to organise any high level event in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No)</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised</p>	<p>Yes, we plan to organize a high level meeting in the coming months. The objective is to report to the Chairperson of the Task Force (Coordinating Minister of</p>

		Human Development and Cultural Affair) on the progress of SUN Movement
4.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Yes, we have Gus Sholah as nutrition champions. As a religious leader, he published His article in Mass media on the nutrition issues and advocate people on the nutrition problem we are facing. He developed nutrition improvement program in the biggest Islamic boarding school in East Java.
5.	Are Parliamentarians in your country engaged to work for the scale up of nutrition in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Parliamentarians for nutrition.	Yes. National budget should be approved by the parlementarians annually, including nutrition budget. They review the budget and support nutrition improvement.
6.	Are journalists and members of the media involved in keeping nutrition on the agenda in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the media and journalists for nutrition.	Yes. The media are involved in the working group and we engage media in every advocacy meeting.
7.	Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	We are aware of potential conflicts of interests in Indonesia, but do not have a formal reporting mechanism yet. The Conflict of Interest guideline is already drafted. This guideline refer to Preventing and Managing Conflict of Interest document published by GSO-SUN and reflected inputs from all stakeholders.
8.	Do you have a Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	No
9.	Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes, the website helps us to look for guidance and information related to global SUN Movement.

10.	<p>To support learning needs, what are the preferred ways to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange? 	<p>Knowledge management platform to disseminate all lesson learnt from other countries</p>
11.	<p>Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
12.	<p>What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities would be most useful for your country? i.e. federal, emerging economies, maturity in the SUN Movement, with double burden, etc. (for potential tailored exchanges from 2017 onwards)</p>	<p>Yes, Opportunities to network between countries that are at similar stages of development (decentralized countries) may be more beneficial, for instance based on the maturity in the SUN Movement.</p>

Annex 3: Common Priorities For 2016-2017:

The table below provides a basic overview of services available to support SUN Countries in achieving their national nutrition priorities in 2016-17. Please review the list below and record your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, so the SUN Movement Secretariat can better appreciate how to maximise delivery of relevant support.

The Policy and Budget Cycle Management – from planning to accounting for results	Social Mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication	Coordination of action across sectors, among stakeholders, and between levels of government through improved functional capacities	Strengthening equity drivers of nutrition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents ✓ Situation/Contextual analysis ✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition ✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF) ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework ✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN) Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level) ✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach ✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness ✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, generating investment and enhancing data ✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy ✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. ✓ Support with strengthening capacity of individuals or organization to better engage with: themes (like WASH), sectors (like Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics) ✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others ✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies. ✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes ✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls

<p>Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence 	<p>advocacy and communication strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis 	
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI) 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p>Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies</p>

Annex 4 – Scaling Up Nutrition: Defining a Common Results Framework

The SUN Movement Secretariat has prepared this note to help you take stock of progress with the development of a Common Results Framework

1. Within the SUN Movement the term ‘common results framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results that have been agreed across different sectors of Government and among other stakeholders.
2. The existence of a negotiated and agreed Common Results Framework helps different parts of Government and other Stakeholders (including development partners) to work effectively together.
3. The ideal is that the Common Results Framework is negotiated and agreed under the authority of the highest level of Government, that all relevant sectors are involved and that other stakeholders fully support the results and their implementation.
4. The Common Results Framework enables different stakeholders to work in synergy, with common purpose. It combines (a) a single set of expected results, (b) an plan for implementing actions to realize these results, (c) costs of implementing the plan (or matrix), (d) the contributions (in terms of programmes and budget) to be made by different stakeholders (including those from outside the country), (e) the degree to which these contributions are aligned – when designed and when implemented, (f) a framework for monitoring and evaluation that enables all to assess the achievement of results.
5. When written down, the Common Results Framework will include a table of expected results: it will also consist of a costed implementation plan, perhaps with a roadmap (*feuille de route*) describing the steps needed for implementation. There may also be compacts, or memoranda of understanding, which set out mutual obligations between different stakeholders. In practice the implementation plan is often an amalgam of several plans from different sectors or stakeholders – hence our use of the term “matrix of plans” to describe the situation where there are several implementation plans within the Common Results Framework. The group of documents that make up a country’s Common Results Framework will be the common point of reference for all sectors and stakeholders as they work together for scaling up nutrition.
6. The development of the Common Results Framework is informed by the content of national development policies, strategies of different sectors (eg. health, agriculture, and education), legislation, research findings and the positions taken both by local government and civil society. For it to be used as a point of reference, the Common Results Framework will require the technical endorsement of the part of Government responsible for the implementation of actions for nutrition. The Common Results Framework will be of greatest value when it has received high-level political endorsement – from the National Government and/or Head of State. For effective implementation, endorsements may also be needed from authorities in local government.
7. It is often the case that some sectoral authorities or stakeholders engage in the process of reaching agreement on a Common Results Framework less intensively than others. Full agreement across sectors and stakeholders requires both time and diplomacy. To find ways for moving forward with similar engagement of all sectors and stakeholders, SUN Countries are sharing their experiences with developing the Frameworks.
8. SUN countries usually find it helpful to have their Common Results Frameworks reviewed by others, so that they can be made stronger – or reinforced. If the review uses standard methods, the process of review can also make it easier to secure investment. If requested, the SUN Movement Secretariat can help SUN countries access people to help with this reinforcement.