

# SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

## Myanmar

### 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 2016<sup>1</sup> 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 (provide number) / No (= 0)
Government	Yes (25 participants from Sectoral ministries)
Civil Society	Yes (7 participants from CSA)
Science and Academia	One from Medical Research but as the participant from MOH
Donors	Yes (5 participants from 4 donor agencies/funds)
United Nations	Yes (7 participants from the UN Network)
Business	None
Other (please specify)	None

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

44 participants were participated in total.

<sup>1</sup>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 type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

**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, it can assess annual progress of networks

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 with convening and coordinating functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement)</li> <li>▪ Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator</li> <li>▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis</li> <li>▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative</li> <li>▪ Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure</li> <li>▪ Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested]</li> </ul>	2	<p><i>Multi-stakeholder platform with different Networks, govt, UN, Donors, CSA,. Regular meetings done.</i> – Some Key stakeholders are missing, such as: media, private sector, parliamentarians, academia</p> <p>Official Nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as well as focals for Key stakeholder groups – Donor, UN and Civil Society</p> <p>A proposed high-level government committee structure was developed last year in support of a Myanmar National Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Security (MNAPFNS), but with the transition in</p>

		<p>government this has not yet been adopted and is currently under review by the new government. So while there are signs of deepening multi-sectoral participation, there is as yet no formal, high-level governance structure in place, although initial discussions with the new Government at high level show interest.</p>
--	--	---

**Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence**

<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"> <li>▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board</li> <li>▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors</li> <li>▪ Actively engage executive level political leadership</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</li> <li>▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc</li> <li>▪ 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]</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>Both nutrition specific and sensitive sectors engaged in Government Network since the updating of National Plan of Action for Food and Nutrition (2011-2015) which was based in formulating prioritized plan for SUN in 2014. A lot more work still needed for engagement in actions on nutrition-sensitive sectors such as social protection, agriculture, WASH, rural development, education and also for strong focus on gender and equity, even though the core principles are already embedded in every programme</p> <p>Within MoH, engagements of other departments (such as Child Health, Maternal Reproductive Health, and Health Education) were not visible by other networks.</p> <p>On a positive note – the development of the Myanmar National Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Security as a response to the Zero Hunger Challenge last year was led by the former Ministry of Planning and also involved enhanced participation from the Ministry of Agriculture. But as this plan was not adopted before the transition in government it is unclear if this expanded membership will be formalized and sustained. As of yet there is</p>
---	---	----------	---

			<p>no sustained and active engagement of executive levels of the political leadership although initial high level discussions with New Government indicate nutrition is a priority.</p> <p>Donor networks are well aligned with bilateral programmes as well as MDTF. However more work is also needed to reach out to other stakeholder members (other donors, development banks, private sector, media, scientists, academics, parliamentarians)</p> <p>No decentralised structures or processes at State/Region levels are in place.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</b></p>			
<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"> <li>▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans</li> <li>▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews.</li> <li>▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues</li> <li>▪ Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>Momentum is accelerating: at the last MSP meeting in March 2016 a draft MSP TOR, operational guidelines and workplan were developed. Work plans still need to be aligned yet; Gvn , UN,CSA NWs defined WPs, However Donor NW – formal organization structure and WP not shared yet</p> <p>MSP stakeholders contribute to discussions on policy, plans, costing (some), annual review (National Plan of Action for Food and Nutrition-updating, Prioritized Plan for SUN – 2014, development of Myanmar Action Plan for Nutrition and FS (MNAPFNS) under high level leadership-2015- not done yet)</p> <p>Delivery of effective results not yet happening; There is no clear Common Results Framework (CRF) to report against; There is no format for networks to use when reporting to the MSP</p> <p>During reporting period, coordination in development of MNAPFNS (prioritized plan for SUN) used the platform of president led committee.</p>

<b>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ 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]</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regular proceedings of MSP circulated</li> <li>1) SUN Implementation Plan (2014)</li> <li>2) SUN –MSP coordination Meeting – 2014</li> <li>3) SUN annual self-assessment reports (2014, 2015)</li> <li>4) MSP meeting 2015</li> <li>5) MSP meeting 2016</li> </ol> <p>There is no clear CRF or M&amp;E framework to use when reporting results. Monitoring/tracking reports are not yet in place on a regular basis. Although different stakeholders have their own individual reporting process in place there is no overall, coordinated review process to support collective accountability.</p> <p>Donors have supported nutrition interventions through CSOs and Government, but so far, they are not reporting against national nutrition indicators. Development partners are, however, ready to support action in this area.</p>
<b>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover</li> <li>▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>MSP mechanism on nutrition not yet fully integrated. It was discussed at the MSP Workshop in March 2016. However, nothing is yet formalised, and it remains to be seen whether the new government will pick this up.</p> <p>The new government has expressed support for prioritizing nutrition and both the UN and Development Partners have briefed the new government leadership on the importance of the issue. Similarly, nutrition is a feature of regular (every quarter) UN Heads of Agency meetings as partners in the UN Network for Nutrition and Food Security(SUN).</p> <p>Institutional commitments are in place, both within the government and other networks. For instance, all CSA member organizations have committed to SUN principals and there is high-level buy in at country and global levels&gt;</p>

			Key stakeholders, GVn, UN, CSA fully engage in development of MSP for SUN. Donors recognized MSP mechanism but need more tangible engagement. Private sector - still advocating
--	--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhanced functioning of Multi-Stakeholder Platform by formalizing organization structure, TORs, operational procedures and work plan. Encouraged NWs to align with their own work plans and initiate operating MSP functions by four strategic process by means of task teams. Invited participation of private sector including business sectors in MSP in preparation for formal organization as network/s</li> <li>- Linked SUN-MSP with higher level coordination mechanism in previous Government (president-led committee for F and N Security); continued advocating the new Government for coordination mechanism at highest level for involvement of decision making level from different sectors (and ministries)</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formal establishment of UN Network, with expanded membership (6 agencies, and 3 more invited to join). Rotating chair (Representative level) appointed. UN Network drafted based on global template, to be endorsed. Work plan drafted, based on REACH CIP. Held meetings quarterly as Head of Agencies and monthly with agency Technical Leads. Also reached out recently to DN and CSN to hold monthly meetings in Yangon. We have improved our capacity to reach consensus, worked jointly on advocacy briefs both within the UN and with DPs in a collective effort to influence high level political leadership. Compiling an UN agency inventory of nutrition actions by May 31. UN Network is holding an inter-agency nutrition retreat on May 31 with numerous agencies to align and strengthen coordination and coherence</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved donor contribution at the level of individual sector</li> </ul>
<b>Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No</li> </ul>
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSA has supported the enhanced functioning of the MSP in the past year through regular engagement with all Networks both formally within MSP meetings and informally through routine information sharing</li> <li>- CSA has been actively building its membership (50 CSOs (35 local) working in 7 states/regions)</li> <li>- CSA has revised its TOR to reflect its evolving role as a SUN network and a coordinating body for local and community-based CSOs</li> <li>- CSA will conduct steering committee elections in May 2016 in order to ensure the SC adequately represents the CSA (and to enhance local representation)</li> <li>- CSA monitors its results and reports to donors regularly</li> </ul>
<b>Others</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No</li> </ul>

**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)

Formalization of organization structure, TORs, operational procedures and work plan of Multi-Stakeholder Platform; Same structural and work plans developed by Government, UN and CSA Networks and alignment in process. High level coordination committee was formed at presidential level but was abolished before handing over to the new Government; Need effective advocacy strategy and actions for new Government. For sustainability development of a national nutrition

policy of multi-sectoral and coordinated nature

Donor coordination has improved at the level of individual sectors, but still needs in the coordination that acts across the sector boundaries relevant to nutrition. High level Government to sit on overall coordination and government led Cross Sector Coordination body to set up among different sectors.



## 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 acoherent 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 PLATF ORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
<p>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 that can inform and guide policy making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations</li> <li>▪ Reflect on existing policies and legal framework</li> <li>▪ Existence of review papers</li> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</b></p>	2	<p>Regular multi-sectoral analysis - not fully and systematically started yet, except reviews to update NPAFN (National Nutrition Agenda) and to develop MNAPFNS (prioritized for SU nutrition and food security)</p> <p>Food law and other sectoral laws and legislation in livestock and agricultural sector support nutrition sensitive issues</p> <p>Last year’s development of the MNAPFNS included a brief overview analysis of multi-sectoral policies related to food and nutrition; however a more comprehensive analysis is needed, especially in light of new and upcoming policies and plans for the country, including SDGs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individual organizations/agencies have conducted policy analyses, but this work has mostly been ad hoc or on a program-by-program basis</li> <li>- The Myanmar Nutrition Technical Network (MNTN), which is</li> </ul>

			<p>chaired by NNC and UNICEF, is doing some analysis of nutrition policies and legislation—coordination with the MS-MSP could be clarified/strengthened</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</b></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. 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</li> <li>▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality</li> <li>▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making</li> <li>▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes)</li> <li>▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Dissemination and communication of policy / legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>No Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy.</p> <p>Piecemeal programmatic-based (rather than MSP pushed) advocacy efforts are in place (e.g. Social protection policy/legislation for extended maternity leave for pregnant mothers, IYCF, BMS, Rice Fortification Policy Brief) but not under a broad comprehensive strategy. Common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making is not yet developed.</p> <p>Since January 2016, The new Government has been provided by an advocacy brief, jointly developed by the UN and Donor.</p> <p>Both the UN Nutrition Network and the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT) have plans to hire new advocacy personnel to assist in a more sustained advocacy effort for nutrition, building on momentum established.</p>

<b>Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies.</li> <li>▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality.</li> <li>▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women</li> <li>▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</b></p>	<p>2</p>	<p>National Nutrition Agenda leverage nutrition in relevant sectors; It could be understood as national ministerial guide for strategies and action plans for mainstreaming nutrition in sectoral policies. It is yet to be updated in line with recent developments.</p> <p>Nutrition was integrated in Zero Hunger response leading to MNAPFNS. IYCF policy with maternity leave entitlement and legislation on Law of BMS coordinated across relevant ministries. Policy brief for Rice Fortification recommended coordinated actions across ministries; Consumer protection law has been endorsed in 2014, March.</p> <p>The NAPA (National Action Plan for Poverty Alleviation and Rural Development through Agriculture) is currently being reviewed, with one objective to increase its focus on nutrition.</p> <p>The drafting process for the MNAPFNS involved some level of nutrition-focused planning and analysis by various key sectors across government, but this plan is still yet to be adopted.</p>
<b>Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation</li> <li>▪ Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation</li> </ul> <p>[Please share any relevant reports/documents]</p> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries</b></p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Myanmar Agri Policy is fully engaged with nutrition under MOA. Animal Health Law, Fertilizer and Seeds Law, Extended Maternity Leave and BMS code, are enforced by legislation as well as for Universal Salt Iodization.</p> <p>However, operationalisation in many areas remain weak. For</p>

<p>Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.</p>	<p><b>are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</b></p>		<p>example, while the current national salt law is in place for monitoring, enforcement is variable and weak. A BMS code technical working group has been constituted as the national body to oversee enforcement and put in place a national monitoring and enforcement system. Overall, there is a need to develop national and sub-national guidelines and build monitoring and enforcement systems to operationalise legislation</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</b></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"> <li>▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc.</li> <li>▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</b></p>	<p>2</p>	<p>There is a great deal of evidence being generated by individual actors and networks;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STEP Survey - every 5 yrs to analyze results;</li> <li>• Civil society organizations conduct a variety of different studies including household surveys, desk reviews, operational research, and impact evaluations. Results are disseminated widely</li> <li>• Health Forum conducted by department of Consumer Protection</li> </ul> <p>However, there has been very few (if any) practice and platform to share and to collectively and systematically review the existence and implementation of policy and legislation.</p> <p>SUN Multi-stakeholder Platform has just been developed the work plan to serve as a platform. The MNTN (Myanmar Nutrition Technical Network) has not met regularly and is currently limited to technical discussions. There are several separate committees for different nutrition legislation at the Department level.</p> <p>SUN-MSP should serve as a high level forum between Government and external stakeholders to discuss higher level strategic and policy issues is needed</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
<b>Government</b>	- NPAFN as National Nutrition Agenda in aligned with WHA targets, ICN2 and SDG; Inter-ministerial coordination in development of MNAPFNS ) prioritized for sale up nutrition and food security); Policy established for IYCF and BMS code’ Policy advocacy with policy brief on rice fortification
<b>UN</b>	- At the request of the previous Government last year, the UN network provided intense technical support to various Government Ministries, under the overall coordination of the Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development to draft the Myanmar National Plan of Action on Food and Nutrition Security. The development of this draft included high level multi-sectoral coordination and governance structure, policy landscape overview and a Common Results Framework for Nutrition, to improve the policy and legal framework for nutrition in the country. Stakeholders are currently engaging with the new Government for leadership and guidance on the way forward with supporting finalisation of the plan. Due to the tight timeline for the drafting of the plan (before elections) a more thorough policy landscape analysis is required, especially give new country context
<b>Donor</b>	-
<b>Business</b>	-
<b>CSO</b>	<p>CSA has been actively involved in strengthening the monitoring and implementation of the BMS Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building capacity of CSOs and communities to monitor the Code</li> <li>- Routinely monitoring a database of violations</li> <li>- Sharing reports of violations with government and other stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>CSA members measure the effectiveness of their programs through impact studies, operational research, use of validated monitoring tools to measure nutrition specific and sensitive outcomes</p> <p>- CSA has been involved in policy development and costing to the extent possible—better engagement with civil society is needed</p>
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)

National Nutrition Agenda and later developed prioritized plans (SUN-2014, Myanmar national Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Security-MNAPFNS) dictated strategies to mainstream nutrition. Several sectoral policies and legislation established relevant to nutrition, but implementation and enforcement is still weak. Challenges are lack of practice and high level forum for comprehensive review and analysis of nutrition policies to align in both nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive sectors; Likewise There also is the lack of Common agreed Policy Framework on Nutrition;

To improve the situation, Myanmar will need to develop a comprehensive multi-sectoral policy for nutrition agreed by all stakeholders and endorsed by Government by means of thorough policy analysis for both nutrition specific and sensitive sectors (all inclusive in and out sides of Gvn) . Advocacy efforts as continuous process with efficient strategies and actions, are needed to influence policy makers. Both the UN Nutrition Network and the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT) have plans to hire new advocacy personnel to assist in a more sustained advocacy effort for nutrition, building on momentum established. National Nutrition Agenda (National Plan of Action for Food and

Nutrition 2011-2015) was planned to be updated. All prioritized plan for SUN should be aligned with NNA

Formation of MP Task Teams to implement work plan on four strategic processes were in process

### 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 actions<sup>2</sup>. 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 PLATF ORM 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 across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews</li> <li>▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping</li> <li>▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Overview done during the process of updating NPAFN and developing MNAPFNS; more comprehensive analysis needed</li> <li>- Some nutrition-sensitive sector programs have been analyzed; School Milk program and Cropping Zone</li> <li>- Stakeholders mapping needs to be regularly updated and in better informed format</li> <li>- No CRF in place for multisectoral nutrition, so no alignment yet</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> ‘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>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"> <li>Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</b></p>		<p>begun.</p> <p>Individual agencies approaches are informed and aligned with specific national strategies but not coordinated and not via an effective multi-sectoral or multi-stakeholder forum. The MNAPFNS has a draft results and M&amp;E framework which presents which, when adopted, will provide an opportunity to establish a coordinated CRF through consultation with stakeholders. Similarly, an updated NPAFN could also be the basis for a CRF</p> <p>CSA has conducted mapping of its members and can work more on aligning member actions on nutrition, but there is a need for more clarity on the CRF</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</b></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&amp;E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives</li> <li>Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups<sup>3</sup></li> <li>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&amp;E; capacity strengthening needs and</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>Medium/long term implementation objectives have been established with stakeholders consultation in National Nutrition Agenda but still need to be updated. Yes – in MNAPFNS – still need stakeholders consultation;</p> <p>No agreed CRF established yet; There were individual set targets and results by different stakeholders but there is no common results frameworks where different partners on working this.</p>

<sup>3</sup>This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process 1



	<p>priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</b></p>		
<b>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources</li> <li>▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</li> <li>▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level</li> <li>▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism</li> </ul> <p><b>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</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Since there is no agreed CRF endorsed, there are only sectoral and individual stakeholders' private project analysis, prioritization and implementations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consumer protection- awareness raising)</li> <li>- School Milk program- in all States and Regions</li> <li>- Seeds industry and palm advisory</li> <li>- Seed multiplication</li> </ul> <p>A structured annual review process involving multi-stakeholders is not established, however there are internal review processes within Government</p> <p>MNAPFNS has and M&amp;E plan and governance structure that if adopted would be mandated to put in place an articulated annual planned and review process</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"> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ Existence of regular progress reports</li> <li>▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits</li> <li>▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance</li> <li>▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Information systems were established in sectoral ministries and in program-wise by stakeholders (such as HMIS and Timely Warning for nutrition specific and in health Ministry), but not a multi-sectoral and not for collective/.joint monitoring</p> <p>Under the previous NPAFN, the Central Board For Food and Nutrition was the internal review forum, but it did not provide for joint monitoring. The new government, is still deciding on a new internal governance structure</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"> <li>▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research</li> <li>▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories of change and implementation progress</li> <li>▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society</li> <li>▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>There are sectoral mechanisms in Government sector, providing reports from research and studies such as HMIS, MICS, Nutrition Research, FDA reports in MOH and so on nutrition relevant programs in Agriculture and Rural Development Sectors, but not disseminated widely and no practice of sharing lessons learnt and social auditing</p> <p>CSA – through LIFT/LEARN and 3MDG - and UNN are working on reports and survey dissemination on particular operational areas (e.g. WFP field and crop assessments), and in certain populations (e.g. IDPs, flood affected) but not comprehensive national effort or social auditing. However, the mechanism by which evaluations</p>

	<p>nutrition-sensitive programmes</p> <p><b>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</b></p>	<p>and findings are shared systematically in a way that informs MSP decision making is yet to be established. This year both a DHS and micronutrient survey will be conducted and these will provide important data needed for future joint analyses, assessments and impact assessments</p> <p>There is a great deal of evidence being generated by individual actors in CSA, and results are widely shared with partners.</p> <p>There are some examples of turning this data into advocacy tools, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cost of not breastfeeding (UNICEF, A&amp;T, LEARN)</li> <li>- One-pagers/briefs on maternity cash transfers (SCI)</li> </ul> <p>... but these efforts could still be strengthened</p>
--	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordinated multisectoral NNA-NPAFN defined common nutrition and nutrition-sensitive targets, short, medium and longer term; so did prioritized plan 2014; consensus with stake holders</li> <li>- MNAPFNS-2015 – prioritized plan developed and aligned with 2014 plan- inputs from Gvn sectors; still need to be consulted with stakeholders, Policy, Mission, Vision present. But weakness in jointly monitoring</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One constraint this past year has been the absence of a clear, endorsed CRF for nutrition. UN network has facilitated several strategic discussions with high level Government and development partners towards a CRF. In addition to supporting the drafting of the MNAPFNS, UN network also begun supporting Government to agree on Core Nutrition Actions for Nutrition, identifying priority nutrition specific and sensitive interventions for scale-up based on country context, which would be a basis for multi-sectoral and sector plans and for mobilising stakeholder support</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	-
<b>Business</b>	-
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Civil society is active in the collection and dissemination of data related to nutrition</li> <li>- CSOs are monitoring the outcomes of their own programs and reporting regularly on their work plans (this information could be shared more widely)</li> <li>- There are some examples of translating data into advocacy, but this area could be strengthened</li> <li>- CSA needs clarity on the CRF in order to support/advocate CSOs to align their programs with national priorities</li> </ul>
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)

Achievements and challenges: NNA updating in process aligning with WFA targets, ICN 2 and SDGs; Prioritized plan MNAPFNS finalization stage in Government. MNAPFNS was developed under highest level coordination (to which SUN-MSP was linked) which has been disbanded with the previous Government

For sustainability as well as for effective coordinated implementation, development of CRF is the priority and it should be part of multi-sectoral nutrition policy as an appendix of National Comprehensive Development Policy



### 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 PLATF ORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
<p>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).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions[please provide the relevant documentation]</li> <li>▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation]</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</b></p>	1	<p>Nutrition-specific section of the National Nutrition Agenda/ National Plan of Action for Food and Nutrition-NPAFN (2011-2015) has been costed</p> <p>Rural development-in Government sector is exercising costed plan in cooperation with Asia Development Bank, and World Bank</p> <p>Programmatic costing for nutrition exists under LIFT and 3MDG, and for government sectors in the preparation of the draft prioritised MNAPFNS. Similarly, recent sectoral plans such as the MOH's recent Newborn and Child Health strategy – that both contained important nutrition components – were costed. However, overall there are systemic difficulties accessing public expenditure data and developing sectoral costings for nutrition, and the link between costed plans and budget decisions remains weak. UNN (UNICEF/REACH) is providing preliminary support on this with a consultant, with inputs into revision of</p>

			<p>NPAFN/National Nutrition Agenda and draft MNAPFNS in 2016.</p> <p>There has been a draft financial framework among donors, but there were limitations to realise this.</p> <p>CSA participated in the costing of the NPAFN, but the multi-sectoral, costed MNAPFNS has not been shared. CSA can collect data on budget allocations for nutrition among members, but need to develop a criteria for what is counted as nutrition funding and receive a formal call for this data from government.</p>
<b>Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Planned spending</li> <li>○ Current allocations</li> <li>○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ 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"> <li>○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public.</li> </ul>	1	<p>Although public expenditure reporting systems exist in government, they are not as yet systematically tracking nutrition budgets and expenditures beyond allocations to the National Nutrition Centre. DPs are able to report individually on nutrition expenditures, but there is no coordination mechanism to link the external component with national planning systems yet.</p>

	<p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</b></p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</b></p>			
<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"> <li>▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps</li> <li>▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</li> <li>▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Nutrition stakeholders work individually with government and bilateral financing from DPs– often on a project by project basis - to identify gaps, but there is again not little coordination or harmonization of efforts and approaches</p> <p>Donors and civil society can fill in gaps identified by government and other stakeholders, but this is not yet happening in a systematic way. There may be lessons to be learned from other sectors (such as HIV, TB and malaria under the Global Fund).</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</b></p>			
<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"> <li>▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments</li> <li>▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities</li> <li>▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>A clear CRF and strengthened coordination structures would likely be needed for stakeholders to make clear pledges for nutrition resourcing. There is as yet no pledge for government allocations to nutrition</p>



	<p>stakeholder</p> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</b></p>		
<b>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</b>			
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy</li> <li>▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions</li> <li>▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions</li> <li>▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</b></p>	0	<p>Without a clear plan and CRF, there is a lack of a framework around which predictable long-term funding could coalesce.</p> <p>Domestic financing for nut-specific sector has been increasing within past years.</p> <p>CSA is actively diversifying its funding. These efforts must continue and be strengthened.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nutrition-specific; Costed plan exists; Domestic financing increased</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UN network has strengthened its engagement over the past year with key donors supporting Nutrition in Myanmar in joint advocacy to Government about key investments for nutrition and the need for a clear CRF and costed plans to inform resource mobilisation. UN network supported a Myanmar delegation to attend the SUN regional Public Finance for Nutrition workshop in Bangkok where clear country actions were agreed upon to start financial expenditure tracking for nutrition. UN has also committed technical assistance to support Government in costing relevant plans which are expected to be further developed and finalised under leadership of the new Government.</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>
<b>Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSOs are managing their own budgets and can track financial commitment to nutrition</li> <li>- The CSA can advocate with its members to share this data, but would need a) specific criteria for “what counts” as nutrition funding and b) a call from government for this data</li> </ul>
<b>Others</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>

**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 government has involved and leading the exercise on FS and Nutrition. However, the framework doesn't allow counting or including the nutrition financing from all stakeholders

Costed plan for Nutrition-specific exists; Domestic financing for nut specific increased; However financial analysis still need to be done

Contribution of Stakeholders outside Gvn sector and donors still need to be informed/shared in MSP and coordinated financial analysis, prediction and tracking mechanism need to be established

**Annex 1: Details of Participants**

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Dr	Dr Yin Thandar Lwin	DyDG,DOPH,MOH	dr.yinthandar@gmail.com		
2.	Dr	Dr Than Tun Aung	Dy DG,DOPH,MOH	aungthantundr@gmail.com		
3.	Dr	Dr Maykhin Than	Director,NNC,DOPH,MOH	maykt2011@gmail.com		
4.	Dr	Dr Theingi Thwin	Director,,Deptment of Medical Research,MOH	ttgthwin16@gmail.com		
5.	Dr	Dr Tun Zaw	Director,FDA, MOH	tunzawdr@gmail.com		
6.		U Aung Myo Thu	Director,Department of Minr,Ministry of Resources and Environmental Conservation	UAungmyothu mine@gmail.com		
7.		U Swe Tint Kyu	Director,Department of Consumer affairs,MOC	swetinkyu@gmail.com		
8.		U Kyaw Lwin	Dy Director,DOP,MOALI	kyawlwindop.@gmail.com		
9.		U Tin Myint	Dy Director,DOP,Ministry of Planning and Finance,	pdtinmyint2014@gmail.com		
10.		U Htay win	Dy Director,Environmental sanitation Department,DOPH,MOH	htynwinyon@gmail.com		
11.	Dr	Dr May Win Shwe	Dy Director,LBVD,MOALI	maywinshwektw2gmail.com		

12.		Daw Aye Aye Mon Oo	MOE,DHREP	ayemonmon72@gmail.com		
13.		Daw Lin Lin Thi	Dy Director,Department of agriculture	lynnlynthi@gmail.com		
14.		Daw Nant Cho Cho Nyunt	Dy Director,Department of Basic Education,MOE	chonyunt.myintkyi@gmail.com		
15.	Dr	Dr Soe Min Oo	Dy Director,NNC,DOPH,MOH	soeminoomph@gmail.com		
16.	Dr	Dr Khing Mar Zaw	Dy Director,DOPH,MOH	dkmzaw@gmail.com		
17.	Dr	Dr Lwin Mar Hlaing	AD,DOPH,MOH	lmhlaing78@gmail.com		
18.	Dr	Dr Myo Min Htun	AD,Dept. Social Welfare,MOSWRR	mmt.myomin@gmail.com		
19.	Dr	Dr Aye Mya Mya Kyaw	AD NNC,DOPH,MOH	ammk.ammk@gmail.com		
20.	Dr	Dr Nyan Myint	MO,DOPH,MOH	Nyanlein.skg@gmail.com		
21.		Daw Khin Ma Ma San	AD,DRD,MSWRR	Daw Khin Ma Ma San		
22.		Daw Htay Htay Lwin	DSO,DRD,MSWRR	lwinlwinhtay01@gmail.com		
23.	Dr	Dr. Aye Thwin	Consultant for SUN Focal(UNICEF)	aye thwin@gmail.com		
24.		U Soe Aung	Myanmar Health Assistant Association	mhaa.central@gmail.com		
25.	Dr	Dr Zaw Myo Aung	MO,NNC,DOPH,MOH	drzawmyoaung1986@gmail.com		
26.	Dr	Dr Hnin Darli Win	MO,NNC,DOPH,MOH	hnindarliwin@gmail.com		

27.		Hedy IP	UNICEF	hip@unicef.org		
28.		Janine Roelofsen	Nutritionist,WFP	Janine.roelofsen@wfp.org		
29.		Yu Myat Mon	Program analyst,UNFPA	mun@unfpa.org		
30.		Domenico Scalpelli	WFP(Chair of UN Network for Nutrition and Food Security)	domenico.scalpelli@wfp.org		
31.		Bryan Luck	Consultant,UNICEF/REACH	bryanluck@gmail.com		
32.		Mary Manandhar	International Facilitator,REACH/UN Network for Nutrition and Food Security	mary.manandhar@one.un.org		
33.	Dr	Dr Mya Thet Su Maw	DFID	mts-maw@dfid.gov.uk		
34.		U Aung Naing Min	EC Member,Myanmar consumer Union	consumer.union.myanmar@gmail.com		
35.		Daw Su Su Mar	Staff Officer,CSO	phyuhinn Su.27@gmail.com		
36.	Dr	Dr Myo Thiri Lwin	Program Officer,MOH JICA Health System Strengthening Project	myothirilwin.mjhssp@gmail.com		
37.		Mayuml Omachi	Project Coordinator,MOH JICA Health System Strengthening Project	Omachi.mjhss@gmail.com		
38.	Dr	Dr Myint Myint Win	Dy Director,RH,MNCH,PSI	mmwin@psimyanmar.org		
39.	Dr	Dr Zeyar Kyaw	Senior Manager,PSI	zkyaw@psimyanmar.org		
40.		Andrew Kirkwood	Fund Director,LIFT(UNOPS)	andrewk@unops.org		

41.		<b>Claudia Antonellelli</b>	<b>Program Manager,EU</b>			
42.		<b>Andrea Menefee</b>	<b>Sr. Nutrition Advisor,Save the Children</b>	<b>andrea.menefee@savethechildren.org</b>		
43.		<b>Jennifer Cashin</b>	<b>Consultant,SUN CSA,Save the Children</b>	<b>jennifer.cashin1@gmail.com</b>		
44.		<b>Daw Wai Wai Lwin</b>	<b>Project Manager,Food Security Working Group</b>	<b>waiwailwin37@gmail.com</b>		

**Annex 2: Focus Questions:**

---

1.		SUN MSP
2.	<b>How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met</b> 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.	2 times
3.	Is your <b>MSP replicated at the decentralised levels</b> ? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.	Yes,IPNI(Magway),Plan IPNI (Kayin)
4.	<b>Have you organised anyhigh level event</b> since the last Joint-Assessment? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event organised, i.e., Forum on Nutrition, Workshop for high-level officials, etc.	Yes,RF,Social protection,World food day,NPM but where these specifically organised by the SUN MSP,or were they happening anyway?
5.	<b>Are you planning to organise any high level event</b> in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised	Yes,GNR Launching and Knowledge Sharing Event on Evidence(October?)
6.	Do you have identified <b>Nutrition Champions</b> in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Not yet
7.	Are <b>Parliamentarians</b> 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.	No
8.	Are <b>journalists and members of the media</b> 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,COM,Farmer channel
9.	Is there any reported <b>Conflict of Interest</b> within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	Yes,Present in Department of Medical Research
10.	Do you have a <b>Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy</b> ? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	No
11.	Do you use the <b>SUN Website</b> , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	No,need to engage
12.	To <b>support learning needs</b> , what are the preferred ways to: – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange?	Access
13.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with <b>humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility</b> ?	No
14.	<b>What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities</b> 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)	With double burden

**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.

<p><b>The Policy and Budget Cycle Management – from planning to accounting for results</b></p>	<p><b>Social Mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication</b></p>	<p><b>Coordination of action across sectors, among stakeholders, and between levels of government through improved functional capacities</b></p>	<p><b>Strengthening equity drivers of nutrition</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition</li> <li>✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF)</li> <li>✓ Development of a Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E) framework</li> <li>✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents</li> <li>✓ Situation/Contextual analysis</li> <li>✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN)</li> <li>✓ Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)</li> <li>✓ Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level)</li> <li>✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach</li> <li>✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness</li> <li>✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, generating investment and enhancing data</li> <li>✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels</li> <li>✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies</li> <li>✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination.</li> <li>✓ 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)</li> <li>✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs</li> <li>✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies.</li> <li>✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes</li> <li>✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ High level coordination Body to oversight Nutrition as high level political priority</li> <li>✓ Multisectoral Coordination led by the Government and engaged by both state and non-state actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Agreed National Strategy on Nutrition – both Specific and Sensitive – realistic and time bound</li> <li>✓ Common Results to Delivered together – First 100 Days Financing on the agreed CRF by both public and private sector.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--

<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive policy and plans review (drawing on work already done for the Zero Draft MNAPFNS)</li> <li>• Comprehensive national level situation analysis</li> <li>• National level stakeholder mapping</li> <li>• Situation analysis at sub-national level (1 state or region, to be decided)</li> <li>• Sub-national level stakeholder</li> <li>• Development of Common Results Framework</li> </ul> <p><i>UN Network/REACH can support all these activities in-country with consultants, other country examples, robust expert-developed analytical tools and visuals, funds for workshops and materials. Our intention is to help the new government set out its future direction for multisectoral nutrition governance and actions (sensitive/specific), help NNC get more support, and help identify ways to analyse, coordinate, scale up actions, track progress and mobilise resources more effectively. This could start with quick government-led deliverables including: core nutrition actions/comprehensive</i></p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p>Leveraging leadership for nutrition at the highest level: <i>UN Network/REACH can support with development of high level briefs to Ministers and high level leadership, and using formal and informal channels to raise nutrition as a developmental issue and recommend the establishment of an Inter-Ministerial Committee on nutrition, and nutrition and food security as a Cluster/Programme under the CSO Statistics Development Strategy</i></p> <p>High level Knowledge Sharing Event and launch of Global Nutrition Report 2016 <i>UN Network/REACH can support in-country with facilitator, consultants, other country examples, international speakers at high level from UN, other SUN countries (ASEAN), donors, civil society, and researcher organisations funds for workshops and materials</i></p> <p>Participatory development of National Advocacy, Social Mobilisation and Communication Strategy: <i>UN Network/REACH can support in-country with facilitator, consultants,</i></p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p>Capacity Gap Assessment for functional capacities in multisectoral nutrition <i>UN Network/REACH/EU (?) can support with facilitator, consultants, other country examples, funds for workshops and materials</i></p> <p>Catalysing a private sector network, with Conflict of Interest discussion initiated: <i>UN Network/REACH can support in country.</i></p> <p>Conducting stakeholder dialogues and analysis at different levels: <i>UN Network/REACH can support in country. Also fund cross-visits to other SUN countries with strong MSPs and functional capacities</i></p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p>Develop an explicit focus/analysis/survey on gender empowerment and nutrition and food security <i>UN Network/REACH/EU (?) can support with consultants, other country examples, funds for workshops, surveys and materials, connections with other countries</i></p> <p>Develop an explicit focus/analysis/survey on equity in the area of nutrition and food security <i>UN Network/REACH/EU (?) can support with consultants, other country examples, funds for workshops, surveys and materials, connections with other countries</i></p>
--	---	--	--

<p><i>policy review/multisectoral situation analysis/national stakeholder mapping/ capacity gap assessment/costing for nutrition in national plans - for which analytical tools, personnel and financing are all available to start work upon government request, and many would be ready for presentation and discussion at a national nutrition event, possibly in early October (?)</i></p>	<p><i>other country examples, funds for workshops and materials, and cross visits to nutrition advocacy events</i></p>		
--	--	--	--

## Annex 4 – ScalingUp 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.