

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Nepal

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 (provide number) / No (= 0)	
Government	19	
Civil Society	4	
Science and Academia	0	
Donors	2	
United Nations	5	
Business	0	
Other (please specify)		

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? _30_____

Process

The process of the multi-sector self-assessment had been shared with all the relevant stakeholders for their inputs and all stakeholders were invited to a half day workshop cum meeting to incorporate the inputs in the assessment report.

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.

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



Figure 1: SUN Multi-sector Self-Assessment Workshop cum meeting on 8th July 2016-Group Work

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 useful as all stakeholders (participants) got an opportunity to stake stock of the interventions together and reflect on them and analyse. A SUN progress update presentation was made to the group after which the participants were divided into four groups aligned to the four processes of the assessment. It was useful as the cumulative aspect could be drawn through the group work. The group leaders made a presentation to the plenary for suggestions and feedback. The presentation of the group work was important to bring meaningful participation of all in every process which led to validation and a meaningful Joint Assessment.

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"> ▪ 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 ▪ 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] 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-sector Steering Committee and Coordination Committee at the central Level chaired by Honourable Vice Chair and Honourable Member respectively of National Planning Commission representing the high level convening governing body. Also the Steering committee at the district and VDC level has been established and functional. • The SUN Government Focal Point has been officially nominated as the coordinator. • National Nutrition and Food Security Secretariat is convening MSP members on a regular basis • Donor convener is yet to be nominated, work is going on to fill this gap. • Institutional analysis of high level structure yet to be done. • TOR needs to be further refined.

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"> ▪ 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts are underway to involve more stakeholders and platforms are being created for their interaction like the academia, media and the private sector. The Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare was on board after the endorsement of the MSNP. Also now the Ministry of Livestock Development (as it has fragmented from the Ministry of Agriculture Development) is on board. • Two workshops completed to actively engage executive level of political leadership. More efforts are underway to engage them in MSNP initiatives at all levels. • NNFSS is working to expand the group and make it inclusive by including civil society groups, private sectors and academia. The multi-sector working groups have been created for effective coordination at a working level. • Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare and Ministry of Water Supply and Sanitation signatories of the MSNP, is actively involved to address the Nutrition sensitive aspect and the cross cutting themes on gender, equity and WASH. Projects working under the MSNP framework like SUAHARA covers GESI, equity. • The main thrust of MSNP is on decentralised mechanism. The demand is generated from the ward level through the Ward Citizen forum (which has representatives from the Disadvantaged Groups) and it finally culminates into a district plan after the endorsement from the District Level Nutrition and Food Security Steering Committee. It is a right based approach which also follows the planning cycle of the local governance. The sync between top down and bottom up planning is well achieved in terms of planning and budget disbursement.
---	--	----------	---

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result based monitoring is underway as the MSNP M&E framework was recently endorsed by the National Nutrition and Food Security Coordination Committee. • The revision of the monitoring framework is crucial to attain the progress marker in terms of results. • Most of the stakeholders have completed regular periodic review meetings with MSNP progress discussions and costed planning. The financial tracking also done using guidelines available from SUN guidelines. • The Multi-sector Working Groups under the National Planning Commission have been useful for sharing, coordination, building partnerships around the Nutrition –related issues and planning. • The MSP discussed on regular basis on various MSNP promotion agenda. • Planning exercise underway to use decision making bodies for advocacy. • Key stakeholder groups have been linked to SUN, other nutrition agency for global support on nutrition/ MSNP. • Participated in SUN Global gathering, finance tracking meetings and annual review meetings.
---	--	----------	---

<p>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</p>			
<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] 	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nepal Nutrition and Food Security Portal (www.nnfsp.gov.np) has been established which details out the prevalent resources applicable for nutrition and stakeholders mapping which reflects implementation aspect of the plan at all levels. • Multi-sector Advocacy and Communication Strategy has been developed and has been operationalised. • Launched Golden 1000 Days Public Awareness Campaign. • The MSNP Results framework for every sector has been formulated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized an M&E workshop on June 2016 with the relevant stakeholders to articulate the practical aspect of the plan. • All stakeholders are engaged in this annual exercise, completed each year.
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 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSP mechanism has been engaged to integrate their sector specific activities into their annual development planning. • MOAD has developed its long term strategy with nutrition as focus program. • NNFSS has been actively working to engage the executive level of political leadership and as a result they have been advocating for the cause of MSNP in general and nutrition in particular. • Institutional commitment from key ministries and stakeholders in MSNP is seen due to the active involvement in the nutrition architecture at all levels.

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	- National Planning Commission Secretariat(NPCS);Ministry of Women ,Children and Social Welfare(MoWCWSW)
UN	- WHO.
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- Welthungerhilfe , HKI (SABAL) and HKI
Others	-

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)

The catalyst in a multi-sector framework is coordination both horizontally and vertically. The coordination is effective and efficient through the nutrition architecture that has been in place at all level to attain this outcome. Recently the platforms to bring together new stakeholders on board have been created like the Academia, Private sector and Civil Society. Succinctly, the progress marker to bring people together in the same space is satisfactory. The drawback being, we have been employing a blanket approach rather than tailored needs when it comes to capacity development of the human resource and institutional strengthening.

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 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 that can inform and guide policy making.	<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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-sector Nutrition Plan implemented in the 16 out of the 28 prioritized districts. • Nutrition relevant activities reflected in annual work plan budget, periodic plan (13th and 14th plan), sector plan (school sector development plan), and sectoral policy (agriculture development strategy). • Nutrition Assessment and Gap Analysis (NAGA), documenting the process of developing the Nepal Multi-sector Nutrition Plan and identifying its strengths and weaknesses, Capacity Assessment at National, District and Community level. • Right to Food Act and Food safety Policy is in draft phase. Food Security and Food Sovereignty Policy is in consultative process.

Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks

<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"> ▪ 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>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p>	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-sector Advocacy and Communication Strategy has been implemented. • Advocacy for reviewing food based dietary guideline (FBDG), IYCF Strategy, National Nutrition Policy and MSNP II. • Joint statements issued for Emergency Nutrition, Generation Nutrition Campaign, commitments for MSNP implementation. • Regular interaction and sharing with parliamentarians for support for nutrition and the 1000 days campaign. • Organized 3 advocacy workshops with the parliamentarians. • Nepal Cricket team Captain, Paras Khadka launched as the Goodwill Ambassador for Nutrition, Food Security and the Golden 1000 Days Public Awareness Campaign. Three Nepali artists were announced as promoters, they have been selected due to their charismatic personality and outreach to the community. • Line agencies, development partners have integrated nutrition in strategy papers. • NPC, line agencies, CSO are involved in these activities of publications, press meets, etc. • Government, development partners as well as Civil Society are actively involved in dissemination and communication of policy/ legal framework by key stakeholders.
--	--	----------	--

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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Honourable President in her policy speech mentioned the need to escalate the Golden 1000 Days activities in the Policies and Programs of the Government of Nepal for Fiscal Year 2073-74 (2016-17). • Ongoing • Right to Food Act and Food Safety Policy is in draft phase. Food Security and Food Sovereignty Policy is in consultative process. MSP consultative workshop is ongoing. • Implementation initiated for relevant policy /legal framework. • Breast Milk Substitute (Control and Sale of Distribution) Act is already in implementation. Flour fortification with iron in roller mills is mandatory by law. Maternal leave of 3 months and maternal care leave of 15 days in civil service. Women empowerment policies across sectors. • Agriculture Development Strategy is in place
Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks			
<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 Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation ▪ 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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breast Milk Substitute (Control and Sale of Distribution) Regulation, 1994. Provision of Maternity leave in Civil Service Regulation. Right to food guaranteed in constitution of Nepal, 2073. • Provision of mechanisms for implementation of aforementioned legislation.

Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact			
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular periodic survey (NDHS, NLSS, Micronutrient Survey, agriculture census), sectoral annual reports and publications and their use. • Regular skill transfer trainings by key stakeholders.

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
Government	- NPCS, line ministries (Ministry of Agriculture Development(MoAD), Ministry of Health (MoH) and Ministry of Education(MoE)
UN	-
Donor	- USAID
Business	-
CSO	- ACF
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)

Multi-sector plan has been supported by the coherent policy of the sectors that has been working to incorporate Nutrition in its profile. The policy environment has been favourable for MSNP. The Agriculture Development Strategy details out the Food Security and Nutrition Plan of Action which have been favourable to pave a coherent policy environment by introducing the pathway of agriculture and nutrition. The National Health Sector Strategy 2015 -2020 outlines nutrition as a cross-cutting issue. Ministry of Health has an array of nutrition related plans, policies and strategies with the aim of implementing cost effective and evidence-based interventions targeting the nutritionally vulnerable groups and promoting the consumption of healthy foods. NHSS emphasises better implementation of these strategies and plans. Increasing use of harmful chemicals, antibiotics and pesticides on food products warrants greater attention of MoH during the NHSS period. Multi-sector Advocacy and Communication strategies on nutrition and food security will be adopted.

The Thirteenth Plan (FY 2013/14 – 2015/16) had also rightly addressed the Nutrition and Food security issue. The operating policies has clearly stated that the existing nutrition programmes will be strengthened to achieve the objectives of the Multi-Sector Nutrition Plan and it will be implemented to improve the nutritional statuses of expectant mothers and children.

The year 2016 has been favorable as the Honorable President in her policy speech mentioned the need to escalate the Golden 1000 Days activities in the Policies and Programs of the Government of Nepal for Fiscal Year 2073-74 (2016-17). The policy, dialogues and advocacy has been crucial to optimize the outcome.

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
<p>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.</p> <p>Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations,</p>	<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 ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions 	4	<p>The process that led to the formulation of the MSNP includes Nutrition Situation Analysis which identified the gaps in the existing functionality of the system. This was followed by analysis of the relevant sectors to reflect on their importance and pathway for nutrition, stakeholders mapping and the capacity assessment at the national and district level to reflect on the gaps for implementing the interventions outlined by MSNP.</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>Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>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 estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</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 ▪ 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>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSNP is a common Result Framework • The implementation guideline outlines the role of the stakeholders at all levels. The capacity assessment at National, District and Community level has been crucial in documenting the capacity of the stakeholders. • The research and documentation process together with functional coordination at all levels has been crucial in preparing a well costed plan of action.

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

Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework			
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSNP Priority Actions incorporated by most of the sectors. • The district costing nutrition plan was developed by 16 districts and budget was provided by the Government. • Districts received funds for MSNP implementation at district level as per the MSNP priorities and guidance provided on how to use these funds.
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 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information are being gathered through sectoral MIS • Nepal Nutrition and Food Security Web Portal is operational. • Civil Society Alliance (CSANN) actively engaged in 6 districts and at the national level. • No Joint Review and Joint Monitoring at National Level.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		
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 of change and implementation progress ▪ 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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DHS 2016 field work ongoing • MICS Survey completed/disseminated • M/E Framework endorsed by the NFSCC and training on M/E framework to sectoral M/E focal point was completed and based on the feedback, the M/E framework will be further improved. • Decision has been made to review the implementation of MSNP and document challenges, best practices and lesson learned. • The NFSCC has decided to initiate preparation for MSNP-II based on the gathered information and MSNP review.

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	Child Health Division(CHD)/Department of Health Services/Ministry of Health, Department of Agriculture(DoA),/MoAD, , National Nutrition and Food Security Secretariat(NNFSS)/ NPC
UN	- UNICEF

Donor	- World Bank
Business	-
CSO	- World Vision International Nepal
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)

Key Achievements

- Emergency Nutrition Responses were successfully implemented in 14 seriously affected districts – covering all building blocks of nutrition.
- Right to Food has been guaranteed by the New Constitution.
- Nutrition has remained a political Priority – Nutrition included in the policy speech of the Hon. President.
- MSNP implementation, initiated in 6 districts, was expanded to 10 other districts last year (16 in total), and has been planned for additional 12 districts for this fiscal year.
- MSNP Priority Actions are being implemented through different projects (4th year of Sunaulo Hazaar Din- MoFALD/WB, 3rd year of AFSP- MoAD) Health sector has scaled up IMAM in 7 districts.
- Multi Indicator Cluster Survey Report available in 2015, data collection for DHS 2016 ongoing.
- National Micronutrient Survey Data Collection completed within this period.
- Golden 1000 Days Public Awareness Campaign, a multi-sector communication and behaviour change campaign, launched nationwide in April 2016
- Zero Hunger Challenge Initiative (2016-2025) was launched by GoN (Multi-Ministry Action).

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSNP is a costed plan • The district implementation plan under the MSNP framework have been costed and the report for the same has been submitted on the basis of expenditure • Government and non-government stakeholders support for the preparation of programmes and budget in periodic basis.

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including; Planned spending, Current allocations and Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government has channelized budget to the 16 MSNP district through Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development.
---	---	---	--

<p>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"> ▪ 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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development partners have well reporting system in place. However, some of the Government stakeholders are less likely to operationalize the reporting mechanisms. • Analysed budget tracking and shared at the international / regional forums and information shared with the respective sector and stakeholders.
<p>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</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, and 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>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion for a budget code for MSNP is ongoing which will be a crucial marker to identify the gaps in resource • Advocacy for additional funding to mitigate the gap in the Government budget is continuously pursued. The EU –UNICEF Project has allocated funds for MSNP as a way to mitigate the funding gap.
<p>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</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</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 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the donor support funds for nutrition have been reflected in the RED BOOK (government’s authentic budget book) and disbursement directly – (On BUDGET, Off treasury).

<p>with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning completed and implementation initiated in coordinated approach. Some of the projects are implementing the nutrition intervention directly (Off BUDGET, Off treasury). Efforts are underway to increase proportion of fund in On budget On treasury system from the EDP source.
<p>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</p>			
<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 continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.</p>	<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>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The resource guideline is being formulated under MoFALD. The Line Ministry Budget Information System (LMBIS) is important and this needs to be strengthened further to have a quantifiable marker for budget disbursement. We have costed MSNP plan that provide us information to estimated tentative resources how much we need per year.

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	- Dept.of Water Supply and Sanitation (DWSS)/Ministry of Water Supply and Sanitation (MoWSS), NPCS
UN	- UNICEF, WFP
Donor	
Business	-
CSO	-
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)

- Though MSNP is multiyear costed plan. Nepal does not have resources mobilization strategy in place.
- Financial tracking and resources mobilization initiative has just started. It needs to be strengthened.
- There should be one resources technical working group to be formed to track the resource mobilisation.

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Hon'ble Member	Prof. Dr. Geeta Bhakta Joshi	NPCS	gbeejoshi@npc.gov.np	9851029519	
2.	Joint Secretary	Mr. Madhu Kumar Marasini	NPCS	mkmarasini@npc.gov.np	9851089432	
3.	Joint Secretary	Mr. Bal Krishna Ghimire	NPCS	bghimire@npc.gov.np	9841353567	✓
4.	Under Secretary	Mr. Krishna Murari Neupane	NPCS	neupanekumu@gmail.com	9741027342	✓
5.	Nutrition Specialist	Debendra Adhikari	USAID	dadhikari@usaid.org	9801070054	
6.	Health Specialist	Manav Bhattarai	World Bank	mbhattarai@worldbank.org	9849748313	
7.	Sr. Sociologist	Prem Nidhi KC	DWSS	premnidhi@gmail.com	9851018862	
8.	Women Dev Officer	Biswo Maya Neupane	MOWCSW	bishwomayaneupne@gmail.com	9841963357	
9.	HoD, Nut. and Health	Sujay Nepali Bhattacharya	ACF	nuthod@np.mission-acf.org	9841469777	
10.	Nutrition Officer	Bhawana Thapaliya	WFP	Bhawana.thapalya@wfp.org	9851087400	
11.	Nutritionist	Richard Mwanditarmi	WFP	Richard.mwanditari@wfp.org	9801083489	✓
12.	NUD NPO	Dr. Lonim Prasai Dixit	WHO	dixitl@who.int	9801010002	✓
13.	NUTEC Coordinator	Uttam Acharya	CHD	uttamozan@gmail.com	9851174680	
14.	Health & Nut. Advisor	Manu Panthi	World Vision	Manu_panthi@wvi.org	9851157717	
15.	Sr. Program Manager	Santosh Ghimire	USAID/SABAL	sghimire@hki.org	9851029552	
16.	Programme Manager	Seema Luitel	Welthungerhilfe	Seema.luitel@welthungerhilfe.de	9851067974	
17.	Food research Officer	Jyotsna Shrestha	MoAD	jyostsnastha@yahoo.com	9841362309	
18.	Sr. Agri.Ext. Officer	Shiva Sundar Ghimire	DOA	ghimiresss@yahoo.com	9841373902	
19.	Planning Officer	Keshav Shrestha	NPCS	Keshav882002@yahoo.com	9841386001	
20.	Program Director	Mahesh Kharel	NPCS	mkharel@npc.gov.np	014211030	✓
21.	Sr. PHA	Giri Raj Subedi	CHD	subedi.giriraj@gmail.com	9851239126	
22.	Under Secretary	Anil Mishra	MoE	anilmishra2165@yahoo.com	9841678412	
23.	Planning Officer	Sita Devi Thapa	NPCS	sitadthapa@gmail.com	9847304618	
24.	Consultant	Madhukar Shrestha	HKI	Hki.madhukar@gmail.com	9841423143	
25.	M&E Officer	Sanjay Rizal	UNICEF	sarijal@unicef.org	9851058048	
26.	Nutrition Specialist	Pradiumna Dahal	UNICEF	pdahal@unicef.org	9802039593	
27.	M&E and Doc. Officer	Shikha Basnet	NNFSS/NPCS	Shikha_u@hotmail.com	9841341694	
28.	Nutrition Advisor	Min Raj Gyawali	NNFSS/NPCS	mingyawali@gmail.com	9851115225	
29.	Adv & Com. Advisor	Savita Malla	NNFSS/NPC	savita.malla@wfp.org	9851101851	
30.	Admin Officer	Sagar Shrestha	NNFSS/NPC	sagar.shrestha219@gmail.com	9841449323	

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>Nineteen Multi-sector Working Group meetings (Capacity Development, Advocacy and Communication and Monitoring and Evaluation and Management Information System). Four National Nutrition and Food Security Coordination Committee and 1 High Level Nutrition and Food Security Steering Committee.</p>
2.	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc. 	<p>Yes there is a District and VDC level Nutrition and Food Security Steering Committee which comprises of the representatives from the line agencies (Agriculture, WASH, Livestock, DDC, Education, Women and Children Officer) at the district level and same is replicated at the VDC level. In addition the representative from District Chamber of Commerce Industry and Trade and representative of development partners and I/NGO working at district level are present at the district level. At the VDC level the institutional set up is the same which includes representative from the service centres, Ward Citizen forum, representative from Health Facility management committee and Chair of school management committee.</p> <p>Roles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse, review and endorse nutrition related programmes that will be implemented in the district and recommended to the District Council for approval, in line with the MSNP Incorporate nutrition indicators in the District Periodic and Annual plan/VDC annual plans Review progress of the line agencies and DPMAS Carry out multi-sector coordination to reduce chronic under nutrition <p>There is a provision for Municipal and Regional Committee as well.</p>
3.	<p>Have you organised any high level event 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.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocacy workshops with the Hon'ble Members of the Legislature Parliament Launch of the Golden 1000 days Public Awareness Campaign Capacity Development training on planning for MSNP at the central level and at the district level prioritised by MSNP (16 districts covered) Media training at the central as well as district/regional level-3 regional level covering 22 districts District Support workshop to review the progress of the district implementation at the first prioritised 6 MSNP districts Sun country study tour-Tajikistan Visit to Nepal
4.	<p>Are you planning to organise any high level event in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised</p>	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High Level Nutrition and Food Security Steering Committee <p>MSNP II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition Situation Analysis Workshop High Level Consultation meeting for MSNP II

5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	The Government of Nepal, National Planning Commission announced Mr. Paras Khadka, Nepal Cricket Team Captain as the Goodwill Ambassador for Nutrition, Food Security and Golden 1000 Days Public Awareness Campaign at the recent event held in April. He has committed to spread positive messages in all his cricket and other forums. He pledged to mobilize the entire cricket team to carry forward the campaign messages.
6.	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.	The Parliament plays an important role—as enshrined in the Constitution of Nepal—in planning budgets and overseeing their implementation. Together with the sector, parliamentarians have a vital role in advocating for certain programs or projects that meet the needs of constituencies, or to draw the attention to increase or decrease the budget under a particular heading. The annual national budget has provisioned to implement some of the specific activities and or project in the constituency under the Parliamentarians. They will select the various development projects on roads, bridges, water supply, irrigation, education, nutrition, health and renewable energy sector. Out of the approved budget/projects by District Council, Municipal Council and Village Council they can invest in nutrition sensitive and nutrition specific interventions and or project in a constituency. Parliamentarians can play an important role and help in bringing about changes in the policies that are favourable to women, children and senior citizens and for social welfare. Three workshops were organised to orient them towards the nutrition outcomes so that they can advocate for it.
7.	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 and they have been trained and oriented towards nutrition so that the messages can be rightly addressed and captured.
8.	Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	No
9.	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	Yes
10.	Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes
11.	To support learning needs , what are the preferred ways to: – Access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – Foster country-to-country exchange?	The Tajikistan delegates visited Nepal (Study Tour) to get practical knowledge on SUN initiatives in practice, multi-sector approach, collaborated efforts, and budget flow mechanism. The delegates shared that the visit was crucial for them to understand the aspects around Political Commitment/Capacity of the frontline workers/Coordination/Monitoring/Advocacy at all levels together with the SBCC component.
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility ?	Yes

<p>13. 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>Emerging economies as Nepal aims to graduate from LDC to developing country.</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 Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making 	<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 advocacy and communication strategies ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multi-stakeholder 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) ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis 	<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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence 			
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p>The existing Management Information System of the sector doesn't fully support the data essential for the MSNP progress update. The renewed sources of information system has been operationalised but this cannot fully make the system functional until and unless there is nutrition indicators or data generated by the sectors. Therefore Support better management of data</p> <p>Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level) Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level)</p>	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <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 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <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 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies.

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.