

## SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2017

### Name of Country

### 2017 Reporting template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platforms in line with the SUN Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) System

April 2016 to April 2017

### Process and details of the 2017 Joint-Assessment Exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2017 were compiled by 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	20
Civil society	2
Science and academia	0
Donors	9
United Nations	5
Business	0
Other (please specify)	

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? How many were women and how many were men? \_\_\_\_\_

**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 type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input checked="" 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, if possible.

**Utility**

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?

---



---



---

**Utilisation by the SUN Movement**

Please note that the filled-in reporting template will be put on the SUN Movement website, unless notified otherwise. Analysed results of this Joint-Assessment Exercise will also be included in the 2017 SUN Movement Annual Progress Report.

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/Targets are 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 Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
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,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structures in place and functioning, such as a high-level convening body from the Government (political endorsement)</li> <li>Official nomination of a SUN Government Focal Point</li> <li>Appoint Focal Points/conveners for key stakeholder groups, i.e. a donor convener, civil society coordinators, UN focal points, business liaison persons, academic representative</li> <li>Convene MSP members on a regular basis: please provide the number of meetings for each identified coordination structures</li> </ul>	4	SUN multi-sectoral Coordination Council and Technical Working Group were established in 2014, and members have been regularly participating in the meetings, including SUN Country Network meetings. Saida Umarzoda, the First Deputy Minister of Health and Social Protection has been serving as the SUN Government Focal Point. UNICEF and USAID as donor co-conveners ensure the active participation of

<p>donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutional analysis conducted of the design and/or performance of the high-level MSP, or relevant structures, also in terms of ensuring gender equality, at all levels</li> <li>▪ Establish or refine the terms of reference, workplans and other types of enabling arrangements</li> </ul> <p><b>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, work-plan or Supporting documents requested)</b></p>		<p>development partners within SUN DP's Network. Nutrition focal points from WHO, FAO, WFP and UNICEF represent UN Network.</p> <p>All together there were 13 MSP/network meetings during the reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SUN MSP - 5</li> <li>• SUN DP's Network -2</li> <li>• UN Network – 2</li> <li>• And several Country Network Meetings - 4</li> </ul>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board, i.e. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</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>▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, WASH etc.</li> <li>▪ Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women's leadership</li> <li>▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally (please provide number of existing decentralised structures if applicable, and Terms of Reference if they exist)</li> <li>▪ Involve representatives from local levels in the national mechanism or create feedback mechanisms between the central and local levels, including the community and vulnerable groups.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Provide examples, if available)</b></p>	<p>2</p>	<p>As per the government order, the terms of reference and membership of SUN multi-sectoral Coordination Council and Technical Working Groups were amended. The main changes include: 1) Separation of the functions between overall multi-sectoral coordination under SUN and school-feeding programme coordination; 2) Expansion of the membership to add important stakeholders.</p> <p>Previously, the existing Development Coordination Council (DCC) Food Security and Nutrition Cluster was used as a coordination platform among donors. However, in April 2016, the SUN Development Partners (DP) Network was created under the leadership of USAID and UNICEF (donor co-conveners). This was based on an increasing DP's interest in SUN,</p>

<p>(e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>		<p>importance of coordinated support towards Common Results Framework (CRF), and the need to push ‘nutrition’ on its own rights rather than always aligned to other sectors such as food security and health. The group adopted its terms of reference; Creation of SUN DP Network clearly helped mobilizing interest and commitment from some donors. For example, reminded of its role in SUN globally, GIZ decided to support SUN movement in Tajikistan, including the establishment of local SUN secretariat, as part of its new multi-year nutrition project.</p> <p>With support from GAIN, Tajikistan Chamber of Commerce and Industry led the process of forming SUN Business Network (to be officially launched in late July 2017).</p> <p>The possibility of involving Prime Minister’s office in SUN coordination mechanism is still under discussion. Once the new Vice Prime Minister is appointed, Ministry of Health and Social Protection (MoHSP) plans to meet and discuss SUN coordination as well as the inclusion of nutrition in the standing agenda for quarterly inter-Ministerial meetings.</p> <p>Member of Parliament (MP) facilitated a stakeholder dialogue on flour fortification (FF), which was one of the first MP involvement in the nutrition related issues in Tajikistan. However, the law on FF did not</p>
--	--	---

			<p>pass in 2016. Therefore, the Coordination Council on Food Safety was created under the prime minister office. Under this council, the working group on MN (micronutrient) deficiency has been established with the aim to review and amend the failed FF law to make it “the law to prevent micronutrient deficiency”.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the 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 processes and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed workplans</li> <li>▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy and legal documents, 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, such as deciding which nutrition problems to emphasise, choosing between possible nutrition actions, or prioritising target regions or groups for actions, among others</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>Government ministries and development partners are regularly engaged within and contribute to MSP as stated above.</p> <p>To further mobilise stakeholder commitment on nutrition, the MoHSP jointly with DPs organised the first-ever National Nutrition Forum. The forum brought together around hundred local and international partners and practitioners from the ministries, research institutions, donors, UN agencies, NGOs, and civil society, including media to renew their promises – eradicate malnutrition among children in Tajikistan through multi-sectoral approach involving health, agriculture, food security and safety, education, economic development, and water and sanitation. The two-day Forum aimed at sharing the knowledge and experience around Nutrition and its linkages with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the National Development Strategy 2030. The participants concluded the Forum with a</p>

			resolution proposing actions required for addressing the major challenges in improving nutritional status of women and children in Tajikistan.
<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)</li> <li>▪ Existence of newsletters, activity and monitoring reports of the MSP or the nutrition coordination system <b>(please share, if available)</b></li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum, such as financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc.</li> </ul>	1	<p>The process of developing Common Result Framework (CRF) and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition has been accelerated since March 2017 when Tajikistan secured technical assistance from MQSUN. An international consultant and a national consultant both based in Tajikistan helped facilitate a series of sectoral and multi-sectoral discussions and consultations with the aim of defining and agreeing on a common goal, objectives, indicators and set of interventions. The draft CRF is ready by June 2017. Once finalized, tracking and reporting on the contribution of each stakeholder will be easier.</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</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 commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	3	<p>As a result of continuous advocacy, Food Security and Nutrition has been included in the priorities of the new National Development Strategy (NDS) 2030 and Mid-term Development Strategy (MTDS) 2020.</p>

of agencies and organisations.			
--------------------------------	--	--	--

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS**

<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or currently, elaborate about the types of partnerships you have in place.</p>	<p>1) Please can you explain if you are engaging with the humanitarian partners? How? Do you face any challenges?</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
--	---	------------------------

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS you have in place:**

<p>Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement</p>	<p>1) Do you assess or analyse how your MSP and/or its members abide by the SUN Principles of Engagement? If so, can you share the results of these assessments?</p> <p>2) Specifically, do you, within the MSP and with partners, act in accordance with a commitment to uphold the equity and rights of all women, men and children?</p> <p>3) Do you promote compliance of stakeholders – and sectors with which you engage – with the SUN Principles of Engagement?</p>	<p>1) There is no formal assessment or analysis; however, so far there is no violation of the SUN Principles of Engagement by MSP or its members.</p> <p>2) Yes. The CRF and multi-sectoral nutrition action plan, which are currently under development in Tajikistan considers the equity and rights of all women, men and children. The recently generated evidence and data, which will feed into the CRF and multi-sectoral nutrition action plan as well as future nutrition sensitive / specific interventions, look into the disparity by wealth, geographical locations, and so on.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>4) Are there cases of incompliance? How do you deal with them (please describe any specific feedback or complain mechanism that are in place or envisaged by the MSP?)</p>	<p>3) Transparency and accountability are promoted specifically by SUN National Focal Point who periodically requests MSP members to report on the action points agreed in the previous meetings. In Tajikistan, SUN business network and CSO network are still under formulation, and there is no conflict of interest case reported.</p> <p>4) No, so far there have been no cases of incompliance. There is not yet a specific feedback / complain mechanism established.</p>
--	---	--

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
<b>Government</b>	MoHSP continued to play a convening role to bring together the multi-sectoral stakeholders. Increased engagement was observed from other Ministries such as MoF, MoEDT, MoA, and MoE.
<b>UN</b>	UNICEF, together with USAID, as SUN donor co-conveners, assisted the Government to make MSP operational. UNICEF and USAID also chair the SUN DP Network. WFP as a chair of DCC Food Security and Nutrition Cluster played a catalytic role in advocating for the inclusion of food security and nutrition agenda in the NDS and MTDS. UNICEF, WFP, WHO, and FAO formed SUN UN Network.
<b>Donor</b>	UNICEF, together with USAID, as SUN donor co-conveners, assisted the Government to make MSP operational. GAIN is supporting the formation of Business Network. DPs active in DCC Food Security and Nutrition Cluster collectively advocated for the inclusion of food security and nutrition agenda in the NDS and MTDS. GIZ has taken a step to support the establishment of local SUN secretariat, as part of its new multi-year nutrition project.
<b>Business</b>	Tajikistan Chambers of Commerce and Industry is leading the process of forming SUN Business Network, with support from GAIN.
<b>CSO</b>	Several international NGOS occasionally participated in and contributed to the MSP meetings.
<b>Others</b>	

<b>OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017)</b> <b>FOR PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space</b> (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)
<p>Tajikistan ensured regular participation in the quarterly teleconferences of the SUN Movement network of country focal points. Since joining SUN Movement, Tajikistan team never missed the teleconference. Also, there is a visible improvement in its participation – in terms of ownership by the government focal points who present their views more confidently than before; and increased attendance of multi-sectoral stakeholders beyond MoHSP. Strong commitment demonstrated by MoF and MEDT are particularly noteworthy.</p> <p>The government amended the terms of reference and membership of SUN multi-sectoral Coordination Council and Technical Working Groups. The main changes include: 1) Separation of the functions between overall multi-sectoral coordination under SUN and school-feeding programme coordination; 2) Expansion of the membership to add important stakeholders.</p>

In the spirit of SUN, the first-ever National Nutrition Forum took place in July 2016 under the theme of “Nutrition is a key for sustainable development”, which brought together around hundred local and international partners and practitioners from the ministries, research institutions, donors, UN agencies, NGOs, and civil society, including media to renew their promises – eradicate malnutrition among children in Tajikistan through multi-sectoral approach involving health, agriculture, food security and safety, education, economic development, and water and sanitation. The two-day Forum aimed at sharing the knowledge and experience around Nutrition and its linkages with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the National Development Strategy 2030. The participants concluded the Forum with a resolution proposing actions required for addressing the major challenges in improving nutritional status of women and children in Tajikistan.

With support from the Government of Nepal, Tajikistan organized a study tour to Nepal, where the SUN movement is well-advanced in engaging different sectors and ministries and developing a CRF. Tajik delegation consisted of 15 representatives from different Ministries and organizations, including MoHSP, Ministries of Education, Agriculture, Finance, and Economic Development and Trade, WFP, WHO, USAID, and UNICEF. They learned good practices on: multi-stakeholder engagement both at central and decentralized levels; SUN governance facilitating multi-sectoral and stakeholder approach; nutrition architecture at different levels and budget flow to allow integrated and comprehensive interventions; and development, implementation and monitoring process of the CRF / Costed Multi-Sectoral Plan of Action for Nutrition. Tajik delegates were particularly impressed with the high political commitment and priority of the Nepalese Government for nutrition as evidenced in the President’s engagement in the national ‘1000 Golden Days’ campaign and the bottom-up planning process with engagement of district and village level stakeholders, including Village Development Committees (VDCs). Adequate state budget allocation on nutrition and efficient budgeting system to manage / monitor not only the government but also donor funds invested in nutrition was of interest especially for the Ministries of Finance and Economic and Development and Trade participants. Existence of social protection program (demand side financing scheme) for women to promote institutional delivery and social safety net program for children to improve nutrition were equally interesting for the delegates. Upon return from Nepal, the delegates shared their learning with other members of the SUN multi-sectoral coordination council / technical working group and together brainstormed how they can be applied in Tajikistan. The learning from Nepal also provided the delegates hands on experience on development of CRF for nutrition, and they initiated drafting the inputs to CRF for each respective sector under the leadership of SUN National Focal Point, First Deputy Minister of Health and Social Protection.

## 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/Targets are achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/Validated/Evidence provided

### Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

The existence of a coherent policy and legal framework should inform and guide how in-country stakeholders work together for improved nutrition outcomes. Updated policies, strategies and legislations are fundamental to prevent conflict 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 Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
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"> <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 policies and legislation analysed</b></p>	3	<p>Tajikistan engaged MQSUN to review the alignment of nutrition policies and plans and development of initial stakeholder mapping of nutrition activities in 2014, as the first step toward the development of common results framework / multi-sectoral plan of action for improved nutrition. This was followed by undernutrition programme gap analysis exercise in August/September 2015.</p> <p>Outcomes of the 2014-2015 analyses were revisited during the reporting period as part of the sectoral consultation process leading to CRF development in 2017. During the two-day workshop on developing a CRF in May 4-5, all relevant strategies and key programmes were presented by different sectors / stakeholders (including water and sanitation, whose engagement was largely missing in the past), and the gaps and opportunities were discussed.</p>

Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, updating 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 updated or new policy and legal frameworks 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 parliamentarian engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</li> <li>▪ Existence of a national gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy</li> <li>▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal frameworks with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality and whether they are fit-for-purpose to ensure gender-sensitive nutrition actions</li> <li>▪ Develop a common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy-making that is pro-female</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 the gender-responsive integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions</li> <li>▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, social media outreach, workshops</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>3</p>	<p>In order to advocate for the passing of flour fortification(FF) law, Member of Parliament (MP) was engaged in the high-level multi-sectoral stakeholder workshop, where cost-benefit analysis was conducted in a participatory manner. However, the law on FF did not pass in 2016. Consequently, the Coordination Council on Food Safety was created under the prime minister office. Under this council, the working group on MN (micronutrient) deficiency has been established with the aim to review and amend the failed FF law to make it “the law to prevent micronutrient deficiency”.</p> <p>As a result of continuous advocacy, Food Security and Nutrition has been included in the priorities of the new National Development Strategy (NDS) 2030 and Mid-term Development Strategy (MTDS) 2020. The first-ever national nutrition forum, which was organized in July 2016 under the theme of “Nutrition is a key for sustainable development”, highlighted the linkages between nutrition and the SDG and the National Development Strategy 2030. It also reminded a 2012 Nutrition Situation Analysis that estimates malnutrition costing Tajikistan US\$ 41 million annually because of loss in workforce and lost productivity due to increased child mortality and reduced cognitive and physical development.</p> <p>As part of the accelerated process of developing Common Result Framework (CRF) in 2017, Committee on Women and Family Affairs, amongst other sectoral ministries and agencies, was mobilized. During the sectoral discussions and the subsequent two-day workshop on developing a CRF in May 4-5, they suggested the roles that the Committee could play in scaling up nutrition – e.g., training of personnel of the information and advising centers on nutrition and ‘1000</p>

			golden days’ and conducting information sessions on nutrition among female entrepreneurs with the aim of involving them in solving nutrition problems of mothers and children.
<b>Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders – the 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 I.e. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines/ advice/support for mainstreaming nutrition into sectoral 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 frameworks, with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality, especially those that can be seen as harmful or in conflict with the rights of women and girls</li> <li>▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies that are nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, 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, etc.</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>	2	<p>In the process of the above-mentioned advocacy (PM2.2), MSP members, especially Food Security/Agriculture, Health and Economic development sectors worked closely to each other. In 2017, the working group on MN (micronutrient) deficiency (mentioned in PM2.2) has been making significant efforts in law making for prevention of micronutrient deficiency through food fortification.</p> <p>During the two-day workshop on developing a CRF in 4-5 May 2017, all relevant strategies and key programmes were presented by different sectors / stakeholders, and the gaps and opportunities were discussed. They included Nutrition and Physical Activity Strategy 2014, which engages multiple sectors, such as youth and sports, academy and science.</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 Substitutes, maternity and parental leave laws, food fortification legislation, they right to food, among others.</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><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence (relevant reports/documents) of law enforcement</b></p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Tajikistan has a number of good policies and laws; however the enforcement is a challenge. An example is the enforcement of Law on Universal Salt Iodization (USI). High-level workshop that brought together leading policy makers, inspection agencies, industry representatives and other national and international partners to review the achievements and bottlenecks related to USI and explore how the enforcement can be strengthened to bridge Tajikistan’s micronutrient gap. The workshop came up with the recommendations on how to move forward with the country’s USI efforts. In this occasion, the concept of SUN and its Business Network was also introduced to the industry representatives and other participants present.</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 good 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>See PM 2.4.</p> <p>The Ministry of Health and Social Protection (MoHSP) in collaboration with its partners conducted a programme review to stock take the achievement and remaining challenges related to implementation of the Child and Adolescent health (CAH) Strategy, and improving nutrition was one of the main priorities of this strategy. Based on the bottlenecks identified and recommendations drawn for future, the MoHSP finalized the action plan for reproductive, maternal, neonatal, child and adolescent health (RMNCAH), including nutrition.</p> <p>In late 2016, the MoHSP also conducted a national nutrition survey to assess the nutrition and micronutrient status of children and women, determine risk factors for deficiencies, and compare the findings with the 2009 survey. Although the survey is not meant for evaluation of the existing interventions, it will certainly inform the future policy</p>

			directions to improve nutrition status of children and women.
--	--	--	---

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS**

<p>If the country or part of the country faces certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) recently or at present, elaborate about the integration of mitigation measures into policies and legal frameworks</p>	<p>1) Are mitigation measures clearly integrated in nutrition relevant policies and legal frameworks?</p>	<p><b>Not applicable</b></p>
---	---	------------------------------

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on HOW WE CAN MEASURE ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND SUCCESSES**

<p>Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)</p>	<p>1) Have you tracked “success” moments with the engagement of high-level advocates? Please consider their public statements, attendance at high-level events, mentions in Parliament of nutrition, etc. and share sources demonstrating their advocacy impact.</p> <p>2) Have you organised a high-level event on nutrition? If yes, please provide details</p>	<p>1) There is no systematic tracking of ‘success’ moments, though certain milestones (such as inclusion of the nutrition agenda into national development strategy) have been observed.</p> <p>2) Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>First National Nutrition Forum</u>: In July 2016, MoHSP organized the first National Nutrition Forum under the theme of “Nutrition is a key for sustainable development”. The two-day forum brought together around one hundred local and international partners and practitioners, as well as the media to renew their promises – eradicate malnutrition among children in Tajikistan through multi-sectoral approach. The two-day Forum aimed at sharing the knowledge and experience around Nutrition and its linkages with the SDG and the National Development Strategy 2030. Findings and recommendations of a number of researches, including Infant and</li> </ul>
--	---	--

		<p>Young Child Feeding (IYCF) formative research, were discussed. The forum also reminded a 2012 Nutrition Situation Analysis that estimates malnutrition costing Tajikistan US\$ 41 million annually because of loss in workforce and lost productivity due to increased child mortality and reduced cognitive and physical development. The participants concluded the Forum with a resolution proposing actions required for addressing the major challenges in improving nutritional status of women and children in Tajikistan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Workshop on developing a Common Results Framework (CRF) to address all forms of malnutrition in Tajikistan:</u> A two days’ workshop was held on May 4 and 5, 2017. The Ministry of Health and Social Protection of Population (MoHSP), UNICEF and USAID were the primary conveners. The workshop had sixty and forty-two participants on Day 1 and 2 respectively with representation from the government - MoHSP (including Maternal and Child Health, Sanitary Epidemiological Services, Nutrition Centre, Social Protection, Planning and budgeting, and Scientific Institute of Pediatric and Child Surgery), Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Industry and New Technology, Ministry of Science and Education, Agency for Standardization, Metrology, Certifications, and Trade Control, Agency of Statistics under the President of Republic of Tajikistan, and Committee of Women under the President of Republic of Tajikistan – as well as developing partners – DFID, USAID, GIZ, UNICEF, WHO, WFP, FAO, Oxfam, GAIN, Mercy Corps, Helvetas, and Aga Khan Foundation (AKF). This workshop, building on the review and multi-sector workshop that had been conducted with MQSUN support in 2015, marked the official launching of the CRF with support from MQSUN+, UNICEF, and USAID Tajikistan. Specifically, the workshop aimed to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide an overview of nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive programs/ activities in Tajikistan;</li> <li>○ Understand the principles and processes of developing Common Results Framework (CRF);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Understand how different sectors/ ministries can contribute to the CRF to improve nutrition in Tajikistan;</li> <li>○ Understand challenges to CRF process and determine solutions; and</li> <li>○ To engage stakeholders in listing interventions in the various sectors to contribute to the CRF</li> </ul>
<p>SMART-ness of nutrition commitments by high-level representatives of Governments and networks/alliances (CSOs, business, the UN system, donors) made since the beginning of 2016</p>	<p>1) Do you have experience with tracking nutrition commitments made by high-level representatives of Governments and networks/alliances? If so, can you explain how you collect these commitments and how you report on them?</p> <p>2) Do you assess the <i>existing</i> commitments and analyse whether (a) they are still valid (e.g. aligned with an up-to-date action plan); (b) they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound (SMART).</p> <p><b>Please share any available evidence of commitments made since the beginning of 2016.</b> Kindly note that the evidence could be looking at new commitments made or changes to existing commitments, to make them more SMART.</p>	<p>1) There is no systematic tracking (except for the analysis of annual Presidential speech), but the high-level nutrition commitments have been noted such as inclusion of nutrition agenda into national development strategy 2030 and the selection of SDG 2 for the Voluntary National Review (VNR) process in 2017. The commitments made by the participants during the first national nutrition forum were summarized into the resolution. During the above-mentioned CRF workshop, government representatives from different ministries and agencies shared their suggestions on the roles they can play in improving nutrition, which are now reflected in the draft CRF.</p> <p>2) Assessment of the existing commitments reflected in the policy and strategy documents was done as a part of the CRF development process in 2014, 2015 and 2017.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Two
<b>Government</b>	Government ministries coordinated new policy/strategy development – including NDS, MTDS, draft food fortification law (law to prevent micronutrient deficiency), RMNCAH action plan.
<b>UN</b>	UN agencies played a leading role in developing a concept note for Food Security and Nutrition and were engaged in continuous advocacy for the placement of nutrition as a national development priority agenda (NDS and MTDS) at a number of high-level meetings. UN agencies also provided necessary technical assistance for strategy / action plan review and development – e.g., Nutrition and Physical Activity Strategy, CAH strategy, RMNCAH action plan.
<b>Donor</b>	Development partners active in Food Security and Nutrition Development Coordination Committee (DCC) Working Group, such as USID were actively engaged in continuous advocacy for the placement of nutrition as a national development agenda (NDS and MTDS). MQSUN funded by DFID globally provided technical

	assistance for desk review of the alignment of nutrition policies and plans and undernutrition programme gap analysis. GAIN provided financial and technical support to advocate for legislation on flour fortification.
<b>Business</b>	-
<b>CSO</b>	-
<b>Others</b>	-

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) 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)**

Major achievements during the reporting period are as follows:

- 1) Increased policy makers’ interest and commitment toward food fortification efforts, including flour fortification and salt iodisation as demonstrated in the formation of a working group on micronutrient deficiency under the newly created Council on Food Safety (chaired by the deputy prime minister). The working group is mandated to review and amend the failed flour fortification law to transform into “the law to prevent micronutrient deficiency (through food fortification)”.
- 2) Organisation of the two major high-level nutrition events with broad participation from multiple sectors – namely, the first National Nutrition Forum (July 2016) and a CRF workshop (May 2017). Both events demonstrated the high-level commitments to position “nutrition” in the national development agenda and bring multi-sectoral stakeholders and development partners around it.

Effective implementation of laws/policies remains a challenge. For the enforcement of Universal Salt Iodisation, there is a plan to update the situation analysis, including the analysis of the legal barriers that prevent inspection agencies from regular monitoring/control of small business.

Building the momentum already created, the second nutrition forum is planned in July 2017 to coincide with the launching of the Common Result Framework, which is currently under development. During the forum, the new data on nutrition status of children and women from the National Nutrition Survey 2016 will be released among other issues, which will feed into the future policy discussion and directions to scale up nutrition.

### 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/Targets are 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 improvements in nutrition 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, women and children, benefit from improved nutrition. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions<sup>1</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 PLATFORM SCORE Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
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	<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> </ul>	3	<p>The programme is aligned to national nutrition-relevant policies, but there are still some gaps and bottlenecks – particularly around nutrition-sensitive policies.</p> <p>In 2015, with support from MQSUN, Tajikistan conducted an undernutrition gap analysis. It identified</p>

<sup>1</sup> ‘Actions’ refer 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>policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions</li> <li>▪ Map existing gaps and agree on gender-sensitive 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>gaps in current programming to address undernutrition in the country and suggested which nutrition-specific, nutrition-sensitive and governance interventions should be prioritised in the Tajikistan context, based on a consensus from key stakeholders in line with the existing evidence including recommendations outlined in the Lancet articles (2013). Building on these recommendations, priority interventions in different sectors have been identified as part of the sectoral consultations to develop CRF. They will form the CRF, which will be launched in July 2017.</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 can 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</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>2</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 priorities</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>The above-mentioned gap analysis culminated in a high-level workshop in September 2015, which brought together key stakeholders from different sectors within government, development partners, civil society, private sector and academia to agree on a common goal for development of a common result framework (CRF) and to start discussing sectoral priorities and contributions towards achievement of the common goal. An overarching goal agreed, in alignment with the World Health Assembly target, was reducing stunting. Skeleton of CRF is now available for further development through stakeholder consultation and inputs.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the study tour to Nepal, which took place from 9-13 May 2016 with participation of 15-member Tajik delegation was to learn from Nepal the comprehensive process of developing a CRF. Gaining the hands-on experience on development of CRF for nutrition, the delegates started drafting the inputs to</p>

<sup>2</sup> This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process 1.

<p>estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E.</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> <p><b>Please let us know if you have used the <a href="#">checklist for quality national nutrition plans</a> in a bid to review your plans</b></p>	<p>CRF for each respective sector under the leadership of SUN National Focal Point, First Deputy Minister of Health and Social Protection.</p> <p>The process of developing Common Result Framework (CRF) and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition has been accelerated since March 2017 when Tajikistan secured technical assistance from MQSUN. An international consultant and a national consultant both based in Tajikistan helped facilitate a series of sectoral and multi-sectoral discussions and consultations with the aim of defining and agreeing on a common goal, objectives, indicators and set of interventions. Outcomes of the 2015 consultation (mentioned above) were revisited as part of this process. During the two-day workshop on developing a CRF on 4-5 May 2017, all relevant strategies and key programmes were presented by different sectors / stakeholders, and the suggested roles of each sector / agency involved to improve nutrition were discussed. This was followed by further sectoral consultations, outcomes of which feed into the draft CRF. Checklist for quality national nutrition plans has been used in this process. The CRF, outlining goals, objectives and interventions, is expected to be finalized by June 2017 and launched in July 2017.</p> <p>Moreover, the plan is in place to elaborate the CRF, once finalized, into a detailed multi-sector plan of action which contains chapters outlining strategy on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration of CRF targets into sector plans and policies</li> <li>- Developing multi-sector plan of action with sector specific implementation plans (national and sub-national levels)</li> </ul>
--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Governance, accountability, management and coordination mechanisms</li> <li>- Financing sources and mechanism, tracking and reporting on on-budget and off-budget funds for nutrition</li> <li>- Capacity development in nutrition</li> <li>- Monitoring and evaluation framework</li> </ul> <p>This will involve costing of the plan and its different components (including training and capacity building), to highlight the financial commitments required over a specified timeframe, both for individual sectors and for the achievement of the overall goal and to assist in the definition of nutrition financing and tracking mechanisms.</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 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 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 workplans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels</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</b></p>		<p>CRF has not yet been finalized (see PM 3.2).</p>

	of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work-plans or implementation plan		
<b>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</b>			
<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 systems (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate agreed upon 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>CRF has not yet been finalized (see PM 3.2). The establishment of information system is one of the interventions committed in the draft CRF.</p>
<b>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact</b>			
<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 dissemination of findings of population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research</li> <li>▪ Capture and share lessons learned, good practices, case studies, stories of change – especially those that empower women and girls – and implementation progress</li> </ul>	2	<p>Monitoring mechanism is in place with different degree of intensity depending on the programmes. For example, within health sector, quarterly reporting of the results of nutrition specific interventions is practised, but mechanism is to track and report implementation results of nutrition sensitive interventions is less clear. The donor-funded programmes typically have a structured monitoring and evaluation framework, including baseline and end line population-based</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society</li> <li>▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes</li> </ul> <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>surveys. The variation is due to absence of common indicators for all different government ministries to report to the Government. This will be addressed through finalization of CRF in near future.</p> <p>The Nutrition Forum, which was organized in July 2016 for the first time, is now becoming an annual knowledge-sharing event. The second nutrition forum is planned to take place in July 2017 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Take stock of the progress achieved since 2016</li> <li>- Review and validate the new evidence created (e.g., new national surveys, studies)</li> <li>- Discuss policy/programme implications of the new evidence</li> <li>- Facilitate experience sharing and cross-fertilisation between sectors</li> <li>- Launch the Common Results Framework and the multi-sectoral plan of action</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Give you view on partnership in EMERGENCY SETTINGS		
<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or at present, please elaborate on the alignment of mitigation/emergency measures</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Are mitigation/emergency measures implemented in a coordinated way?</li> <li>2) Is there a minimum multi-sectoral package for emergency that is being implemented? If so, can you elaborate?</li> </ol>	<p>Not applicable</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
<p><b>Government</b></p>	<p>The government ministries keep ensuring alignment of their programmes to the relevant national policies. The SUN government focal point and technical focal point led the process of CRF development with technical assistance from MQSUN. The government ministries were fully engaged in the extensive consultation</p>

	process toward CRF development. Ministry of Health and Social Protection, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade participated in the Nepal study tour.
<b>UN</b>	UNICEF, together with USAID, as SUN co-convenor for development partners, assisted the coordination of technical assistance from MQSUN and the organization of associated work (including a consultation workshop). WFP, FAO, and WHO were also engaged in the CRF consultation process. UNICEF, together with USAID supported the study tour to Nepal, and UNICEF, WFP and WHO staff participated in it.
<b>Donor</b>	USAID, together with UNICEF, as SUN co-convenor for development partners, assisted the coordination of technical assistance from MQSUN and the organization of associated work (including a consultation workshop). Other development partners such as GIZ, DFID, GAIN, and EU were also engaged in the CRF consultation process. USAID, together with USAID supported the study tour to Nepal, and a USAID staff participated in it.
<b>Business</b>	
<b>CSO</b>	Many international NGOs participated in the CRF consultation process. Mercy Corps also participated in the Nepal study tour.
<b>Others</b>	

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 3: Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan (aligned programming)**  
 (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

The process of developing Common Result Framework (CRF) and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition has been accelerated since March 2017 when Tajikistan secured technical assistance from MQSUN. An international consultant and a national consultant both based in Tajikistan helped facilitate a series of sectoral and multi-sectoral discussions and consultations with the aim of defining and agreeing on a common goal, objectives, indicators and set of interventions. During the two-day workshop on developing a CRF on 4-5 May 2017, all relevant strategies and key programmes were presented by different sectors / stakeholders, and the suggested roles of each sector / agency involved to improve nutrition were discussed. This was followed by further sectoral consultations, outcomes of which feed into the draft CRF. The CRF is expected to be finalized by June 2017 and launched in July 2017.

Moreover, the plan is in place to elaborate the CRF, once finalized, into a detailed multi-sector plan of action which contains chapters outlining strategy on:

- Integration of CRF targets into sector plans and policies
- Developing multi-sector plan of action with sector specific implementation plans (national and sub-national levels)
- Governance, accountability, management and coordination mechanisms
- Financing sources and mechanism, tracking and reporting on on-budget and off-budget funds for nutrition
- Capacity development in nutrition
- Monitoring and evaluation framework

This will involve costing of the plan and its different components (including training and capacity building), to highlight the financial commitments required over a specified timeframe, both for individual sectors and for the achievement of the overall goal and to assist in the definition of nutrition financing and tracking mechanisms.

The Nutrition Forum, which was organized in July 2016 for the first time with engagement of over 100 multi-sectoral stakeholders, is now becoming an annual knowledge-sharing and stock-taking event. The second nutrition forum is planned to take place in July 2017 to: take stock of the progress achieved since 2016; review and validate the new

evidence created (e.g., new national surveys, studies); discuss policy/programme implications of the new evidence; facilitate experience sharing and cross-fertilisation between sectors; and launch the Common Results Framework and the multi-sectoral plan of action

## Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

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/Targets are 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 of the CRF

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
This progress marker looks at the extent to which the Government 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"> <li>Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions (<b>please provide relevant documentation</b>)</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 (<b>please provide relevant documentation</b>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4:</b> Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	1	<p>Plan is in place to elaborate the CRF, once finalized in June 2017, into a detailed multi-sector plan of action. This will involve costing of the plan and its different components to highlight the financial commitments required over a specified timeframe, both for individual sectors and for the achievement of the overall goal and to assist in the definition of nutrition financing and tracking mechanisms.</p> <p>Moreover, Ministry of Health and Social Protection (Mohs) undertook an exercise to define and costing of the essential Reproductive, Maternal, Neonatal, Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH) Service Package at different level of care. The package</p>

			includes the essential nutrition-specific interventions. The cost of the package is currently being validated by MoHSP and other relevant stakeholders.
<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 sex, where relevant, 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> <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>	3	Tajikistan took part in the exercise to track financial resources for nutrition, using “3 Steps Approach” and the final outcomes of this exercise are available for 2014, 2015, and 2016 budget. This is yet to be institutionalized.
<b>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise</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;</li> </ul>	0	This will be done upon development of CRF and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition.

<p>additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<p>continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		
<b>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</b>			
<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 another in-country stakeholder</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</b></p>	N/A	There is no information available to comment.
<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</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> </ul>	0	This will be done as part of the development of multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition.

<p>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 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>		
---	---	--	--

<b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS</b>		
<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or ongoing, elaborate about the finance of mitigation measures</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations?</li> <li>2) Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how?</li> </ol>	<p>Not applicable</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
<p><b>Government</b></p>	<p>Ministry of Health and Social Protection and Ministry of Finance lead the exercise to track financial resources for nutrition, using ‘3 steps approach’. The technical focal points participated in the regional workshops in Bangkok. SUN national focal point and technical focal point lead the process of developing CRF and costed multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition. MoHSP is also conducting an exercise to define and cost the essential RMNCAH service package which includes proven nutrition-specific interventions.</p>
<p><b>UN</b></p>	<p>UNICEF is providing technical and financial support to the financial tracking exercise using ‘3 steps approach’. UNICEF, together with USAID, as SUN co-convenor for development partners, assisted the coordination of technical assistance from MQSUN and the organization of associated work (including a consultation workshop) to develop CRF and costed multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition. WFP, FAO, and WHO were also engaged in the CRF consultation process. UNICEF, together with USAID supported the study tour to Nepal, and UNICEF, WFP and WHO staff participated in it. UNICEF is funding the exercise to define and cost the essential RMNCAH service package including nutrition-specific interventions.</p>
<p><b>Donor</b></p>	<p>USAID, together with UNICEF, as SUN co-convenor for development partners, assisted the coordination of technical assistance from MQSUN and the organization of associated work (including a consultation workshop) to develop CRF and costed multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition. Other development partners such as GIZ, DFID, GAIN, and EU were also engaged in the CRF consultation process.</p>
<p><b>Business</b></p>	

<b>CSO</b>	A number of international NGOs participated in the CRF consultation process.
<b>Others</b>	

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation** (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvement/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Tajikistan took part in the exercise to track financial resources for nutrition, using “3 Steps Approach” and the final outcomes of this exercise are available for 2014, 2015, and 2016 budget. The plan is to include donor contribution in its future analysis. Joint work between Ministry of Health and Social Protection and Ministry of Finance on this exercise created a foundation for further collaboration around budget allocation process.

In 2016, Ministry of Health and Social Protection also plans to embark on the exercise to define and cost the essential reproductive, maternal, neonatal, child and adolescent health / nutrition service package, which will contribute to the better understanding about costed estimations of nutrition related actions (mostly nutrition specific interventions). The preliminary cost estimate is now available and under validation.

Other aspects of costing, financial tracking and resource mobilisation will be addressed upon finalization of CRF and in the process of elaborating it into multi-sectoral plan of action in 2017/2018.

**Annex 1: Common priorities for 2017-2018**

2015-2016 priorities	Please reflect on the completion of the work vis-a-vis your priorities:

<p>Were you able to respond to and address the identified priorities for the year ahead, as per your 2016 Joint-Assessment? Which ones were realised and which ones were not? What went well? What went wrong?</p> <p>Could the Multi-Stakeholder Platform coordinate the response of the actors to the identified annual priority action areas?</p> <p>If not, were you able to access external technical assistance as required? What went well? What went wrong?</p>	<p>Tajikistan made a significant stride in three major priorities identified last year: i) development of Common Results Framework (CRF); ii) conceptualization of a nationwide nutrition campaign on 1,000 days; and iii) engagement of journalists to ensure adequate and appropriate media coverage of nutrition. Two other priorities – i.e., a strategic plan for decentralization of SUN movement and strategy to empower community – will be addressed as part of the translation of CRF into multi-sectoral nutrition plan in the coming year.</p> <p>Multi-stakeholder platform played a key coordination role in development of CRF, in particular, as all sectoral inputs solicited through sectoral consultation were presented and discussed at MSP level and beyond, under the leadership of SUN National Focal Point.</p> <p>For CRF development, Tajikistan secured the technical assistance from MQSUN. An international consultant (hired through MQSUN) and a national consultant (hired by UNICEF), who were based in the country, with support from a UK-based expert in distance, provided substantial contribution to accelerating the process of developing CRF in 2017.</p>
---	--

**Please list your key priorities for 2017-2018, providing details, as required**

Please list your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, including if support from the SUN Movement support system (SUN Movement Secretariat, Executive Committee, Lead Group, Coordinator, Global Networks, experts) is foreseen to achieve the latter

2017/8 priority

Elaboration of the CRF into a detailed, costed, multi-sector plan of action which contains chapters outlining strategy on:

- Integration of CRF targets into sector plans and policies
- Developing multi-sector plan of action with sector specific implementation plans (national and sub-national levels)
- Governance, accountability, management and coordination mechanisms
- Financing sources and mechanism, tracking and reporting on on-budget and off-budget funds for nutrition
- Capacity development in nutrition
- Monitoring and evaluation framework
- Cost of the overall plan and its different components

External support – experts (MQSUN) are required to facilitate the above process.

Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period? If yes, provide details.

Yes. The third nutrition forum (and to make it as a regional or sub-regional event in Central Asia by inviting participants from the neighbouring countries in the region). SUN Movement Secretariat and Coordinator are also cordially invited to this regional event.

**Annex 2: Details of Joint-Assessment of National Multi-Stakeholder Platform participants**

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN Role (if applicable)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.		Saida Umarzoda	Ministry of Health and Social Protection of the Population (MHSP)	National SUN Coordinator	saida.umarova@bk.ru	918698047	yes
2.		Rahmatulloev Sherali	MHSP	SUN Technical Coordinator	sheralir.ru	934248080	yes
3.		Lailo Kurbonmamadova	Intrahealth	SUN MSP member	lkurbonmamadova@intrahealth.org		
4.		Gylya Razikova	Intrahealth	SUN MSP member	grazykova@tjhna.org		
5.		Gafurov A. I.	Ministry of industry and new technologies	SUN MSP member		935816619	
6.		Bozorov A.J.	Tajikstandart Agency	SUN MSP member	bozorov87@mail.ru	918775253	
7.		Sultonov	Tajikstandart agency	SUN MSP member			
8.		Mahmadalizoda A.M.	Committee of yourth, Sport and tourism	SUN MSP member	abdulokaluga@mail.ru	935876000,	
9.		Khairov Kh.S.	Director of republican nutrition center	SUN MSP member	khairov1@yandex.ru	900908118,	
10.		Yahyokhojaev A. U.	Ministry of agriculture	SUN MSP member	abbos-1959@mail.ru	928420094	
11.		Andrea Berardo	WFP	Member of SUN DP network	andrea.berardo@wfp.org		

12.		Malohat Shabanova	Nutrition program assistant WFP,	<b>SUN MSP/DP network member</b>	Malohat.shabanova@efp.org		
13.		Safarov Sh. J.	Ministry of agriculture	SUN MSP member	sherali-2009@mail.ru		
14.		Ghoibova D.S.	PHC	SUN MSP member	gds1960@mail.ru	904554519,	
15.		Aminov O.T.	Pediatric Research Institute	SUN MSP member	oaminzoda@list.ru	917345411	
16.		Kulov A.N.	Statistic Agency	SUN MSP member	abduvalinabi@mail.ru	2214991,	
17.		Laura Cimzo	Deputy of the Head of USAID	<b>Member of the SUN DP network</b>	icizmo@usaid.org	2292405	
18.		Samantha Huffman	Health Team Lead of USAID	<b>Member of the SUN DP Network</b>	shuffman@usaid.gov	+992-98-102-0066	
19.		Malika Makhkambaeva	Health Specialist, USAID	Member of the SUN DP Network	mmakhkambaeva@usaid.gov		
20.		Thomas Lux	Head of GIZ	Member of the SUN DP Network	Thomas.lux@giz.de	98888541,	
21.		Cristoph Bunge	Programme Director, GIZ	Member of the SUN DP Network	christoph.bunge@giz.de	98 5135 100	
22.		Mukaddam Shihzodaeva	MCH/Nutrition Project Manager	<b>Member of the SUN DP Network</b>	mukaddam.shohzodaeva@giz.de	98 584 3273	
23.		Assomuddinov Fazliddin	Ministry of health	SUN MSP Member	asomuddinov_fazliddin@mail.ru	907981858,	
24.		Mirzoeva R.	Ministry of fiance,	SUN MSP Member	mruzigul@mail.ru	918687912,	

25.		Abdulloeva S.	Nutrition Officer, UNICEF	<b>SUN MSP/SUN DP Network member</b>	sabdulloeva@unicef.org	939998919,	
26.		Khadichamo Boymatova	Nutrition Officer, WHO	<b>SUN DP Network member</b>	boymatovak@who.int		
27.		Kurbonov K.B.	Ministry of health and social protection	SUN MSP member	kgarhandy@mail.ru		
28.		Muminova M.M.	Committee of TV and Radio	SUN MSP Member	maxi_1002@mail.ru	901311131,	
29.		Mutriba Latipova	Country coordinator, GAIN	<b>SUN DP Network member</b>	mlatypova@gainhealth.org		
30.		Sabrina Qandanova	Health and Nutrition Consultant, WB	<b>SUN DP Network member</b>	sqandanova@worldbank.org		
31.		Ibrogim Akhmadov	FS&N Counsoltant, FAO	<b>Member of the SUN DP Network</b>	ibrohim.ahmadov@fao.org		
32.		Khojaeva M.	Ministry of health and social protection	SUN MSP Member	ma2009@mail.ru	907941412,	
33.		Odinaeva M.	Ministry of economic development & trade	SUN MSP Member	Mohtob_odinaeva@mail.ru	2278504,	
34.		Rahmatulloeva S.	Ministry of health	SUN MSP Member	sanavbar2010@list.ru	9335058471	