

# SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

## Tajikistan

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

April 2015 to April 2016

#### Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016<sup>1</sup> were compiled from stakeholders, and to what extent the process was useful to in-country stakeholders, please provide us with the following details:

##### Participation

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

Group	Yes (provide number) / No (= 0)
Government	16
Civil Society	1
Science and Academia	2
Donors	8
United Nations	4
Business	0
Other (please specify)	

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? \_\_31\_\_

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

**Process**

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

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

**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 extremely useful, especially taking into consideration that the SUN focal point was recently changed and the SUN platform was expanded to additional members. For all new members, including the current SUN focal point this was the first self-assessment exercise through which they learned about the process and progress made so far.

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**

<p><b>PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action</b></p> <p>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.</p>			
<p><b>Progress marker 1.1: Select / develop coordinating mechanisms at country level</b></p>			
DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement)</li> <li>▪ Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator</li> <li>▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis</li> <li>▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative</li> <li>▪ Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure</li> <li>▪ Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested]</li> </ul>	4	<p>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. Apart from the convening agency, Ministry of Health and Social Protection (MoHSP), Ministry of Finance (MoF) and Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT) are among the most active members.</p> <p>First Deputy Minister of Health and Social Protection has been serving as the SUN Government Focal Point. In early 2016, upon the retirement of</p>

			<p>Dr. Lola Bobohojieva, the former SUN Focal Point, Dr. Saida Umarzoda, the newly appointed First Deputy Minister has taken over the SUN Focal Point position.</p> <p>UNICEF and USAID as donor co-conveners ensure the active participation of development partners.</p>
--	--	--	--

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board</li> <li>▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors</li> <li>▪ Actively engage executive level political leadership</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</li> <li>▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc</li> <li>▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally, and create a feedback loop between the central and local levels, including community, and vulnerable groups. [Provide examples, if available]</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>The government order is being prepared to amend 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> <p>The existing Development Coordination Council (DCC) Food Security and Nutrition Cluster has been used as a coordination platform among donors. However, for the first time in April 2016, the DP Network meeting specifically dedicated to SUN was organized based on an increasing DP’s interest in SUN, importance of coordinated support toward Common Results Framework (CRF) development, and the need to push ‘nutrition’ on its own right, rather than always aligned to any particular sector such as health or food security. The Network meeting will be organized quarterly, in alignment with DCC Food Security and Nutrition cluster.</p> <p>Formation of Business Network is underway, with support from GAIN.</p> <p>The possibility of involving Prime Minister’s office in SUN coordination mechanism is under discussion. Once the new Vice Prime Minister is appointed, MoHSP plans to meet and discuss SUN coordination as well as the inclusion of</p>

			<p>nutrition in the standing agenda for quarterly inter-Ministerial meetings.</p> <p>Member of Parliament (MP) facilitated a stakeholder dialogue on flour fortification, which was one of the first MP involvement in the nutrition related issues in Tajikistan.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans</li> <li>▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews.</li> <li>▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues</li> <li>▪ Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>See PM1.3. Government ministries and development partners are regularly engaged within and contribute to MSP.</p>

<b>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [Supporting documents requested from the latest reporting cycle]</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum e.g. financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>Tajikistan is working on the development of Common Result Framework (CRF) and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition. Once developed, 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 of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover</li> <li>▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>As a result of continuous advocacy, it is envisaged that Food Security and Nutrition be included in the priorities of the new National Development Strategy (NDS) 2030 and Mid-term Development Strategy (MTDS) 2020.</p> <p>See also PM1.2</p>

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One</b>
<b>Government</b>	<p>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, and MoE.</p>
<b>UN</b>	<p>UNICEF, together with USAID, as SUN donor co-conveners, assisted the Government to make MSP operational. 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.</p>
<b>Donor</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>Business</b>	<p>It is still under formation.</p>
<b>CSO</b>	<p>Several international NGOS occasionally participated in and contributed to the MSP meetings.</p>
<b>Others</b>	

**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)

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.

Presently, the government order is being prepared to amend 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.

With support from the Government of Nepal, Tajikistan organized a study tour to Nepal for 15 MSP members to learn good practices on: Multi-stakeholder engagement (both at central and decentralized levels); Development, implementation and monitoring process of the Common Results Framework / Costed Multi-Sectoral Plan of Action for Nutrition; and Integrated, comprehensive nutrition interventions. It took place in May 2016 (9-13 May), but all the preparatory activities were done during the reporting period.

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

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

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

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

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and	<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> </ul>	3	Tajikistan engaged MQSUN to review the alignment of nutrition policies and plans and development of initial stakeholder mapping of nutrition activities in



<p>sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can inform and guide policy making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of review papers</li> <li>▪ Indicate any nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</b></p>		<p>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>During the reporting period, the Government also undertook an internal analysis of the newly approved Nutrition and Physical Activity Strategy. The analysis highlighted the need for broader stakeholder/sector engagement than what is envisaged in the strategy, and thus justified the benefit of developing common result framework and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of an updated or new policy and legal framework for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</li> <li>▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality</li> <li>▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making</li> <li>▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes)</li> <li>▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>In order to advocate for the passing of flour fortification law, Member of Parliament was engaged in the high-level multi-sectoral stakeholder workshop, where cost-benefit analysis was conducted in a participatory manner.</p> <p>As a result of continuous advocacy, it is envisaged that Food Security and Nutrition be included in the priorities of the new National Development Strategy (NDS) 2030 and Mid-term Development Strategy (MTDS) 2020.</p>

<p>encouraging parliamentary engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower the most vulnerable and disadvantaged (children and women) through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, 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>		
---	--	--	--

<b>Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders - government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners - coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies.</li> <li>▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality.</li> <li>▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women</li> <li>▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</b></p>	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.</p> <p>In 2014, Tajikistan approved Nutrition and Physical Activity Strategy, 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 Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, 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 [Please share any relevant reports/documents]</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</b></p>	2	<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 policymakers, 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</p>

			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.
<b>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</b>			
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.	<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>	2	<p>See PM 2.4.</p> <p>The Ministry of Health and Social Protection (MoHSP) in collaboration with its partners also conducted a programme review to take stock 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 is in the process of finalizing the new action plan for reproductive, maternal, neonatal, child, and adolescent health (RMNCAH), including nutrition.</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, 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 USAID 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 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)

Major achievements during the reporting period are as follows: 1) Inclusion of food security and nutrition as a separate goal for the new National Development Strategy (NDS) 2030 and Mid-term Development Strategy (MTDS) 2020; 2) Increased policy makers’ interest and commitment toward food fortification efforts, including flour fortification and salt iodisation; 3) Inclusion of parliamentarians in the discourse on nutrition related policies/programming for the first time; and 4) Review and consolidation of nutrition-relevant policies and strategies, including Child and Adolescent Health Strategy and Nutrition and Physical Activity Strategy.

Effective implementation of laws/policies still 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.

In order to heighten the political commitment towards scaling up nutrition, a high-level national conference on nutrition is planned to coincide with the launching of the Common Result Framework, which is currently under development. There is also a plan to advocate for inclusion of ‘nutrition’ as a key message in the annual Presidential speech delivered at the beginning of 2017, making 2017 ‘a year of nutrition’ in Tajikistan.

### Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

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

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

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to nutrition improvement demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, in particular women and children, benefit from an improved nutrition status. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions<sup>2</sup>. The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed across different sectors of Governments and among key stakeholders through a negotiated process. The existence of agreed common results would enable stakeholders to make their actions more nutrition driven through increased coordination or integration. In practice, a CRF may result in a **set of documents that are recognised as a reference point** for all sectors and stakeholders that work together for scaling up nutrition impact.

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL 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, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews</li> <li>▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping</li> <li>▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions</li> <li>▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks</li> </ul>	2	<p>The programme are aligned to national nutrition-relevant policies, but here 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 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</p>

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

<p>review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</b></p>		<p>consensus from key stakeholders in line with the existing evidence including recommendations outlined in the Lancet articles (2013).                  Prioritisation of these interventions will assist in developing complementary, multi-sectoral programmes for addressing undernutrition in Tajikistan, organised around a common results framework.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&amp;E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives</li> <li>▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups<sup>3</sup></li> <li>▪ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender); cost estimates of included interventions ; cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities</li> <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>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 in May (9-13 May) 2016 with participation of 15-member Tajik delegation was to learn from Nepal the comprehensive process of developing a CRF. The study tour participants are expected to play a key role in finalizing the CRF and costed multisectoral plan of action for nutrition.</p>

<sup>3</sup> 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"> <li>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources</li> <li>▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</li> <li>▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level</li> <li>▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan</b></p>	<p>0</p>	<p>CRF has not yet been developed (See PM 3.2).</p>
Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information System (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate the agreed indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance</li> <li>▪ Existence of regular progress reports</li> <li>▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>CRF has not yet been developed (See PM 3.4).</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		
<b>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate 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 disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research</li> <li>▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories of change and implementation progress</li> <li>▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society</li> <li>▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and 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>	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 endline population-based 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 development of CRF in near future.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
<b>Government</b>	<p>The government ministries keep ensuring alignment of their programmes to the relevant national policies. The SUN government focal point requested and solicited assistance from MQSUN to develop CRF and conduct the associated preparatory work. The government ministries were engaged in the consultation 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.</p>

<b>UN</b>	UNICEF, together with USAID, as SUN co-convener 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-convener 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 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>	A number of 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 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)

Tajikistan mobilized the technical assistance from MQSUN to develop a common results framework (CRF) and costed multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition. In August 2015, a programming gap analysis was undertaken through stakeholder consultation and a review of existing documents. This 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 CRF and to start discussing sectoral priorities and contributions towards achievement of that 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.

With support from the Government of Nepal, Tajikistan organized a study tour to Nepal for 15-member Tajik delegation in May 2016. One of the objectives was to learn good practices on the development, implementation and monitoring process of the Common Results Framework / Costed Multi-Sectoral Plan of Action for Nutrition. The learning from this study tour will inform the further process of finalising CRF and developing a costed multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition in Tajikistan.

### 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"> <li>▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions [please provide the relevant documentation]</li> <li>▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation]</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</b></p>	0	This will be done upon finalisation of CRF and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition.

#### 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Planned spending</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	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 both 2014 and 2015 budget. This is yet to be institutionalized.
---	---	---	---

<p>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>○ Current allocations</li> <li>○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period)</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.</li> <li>○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information</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>		
<p><b>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps</li> <li>▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</li> <li>▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising</li> </ul>	<p>0</p>	<p>This will be done upon development of CRF and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition.</p>

	<p>additional domestic and external resources.</p> <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 other 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>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>There is no information available to comment.</p>
<b>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy</li> <li>▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions</li> <li>▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions</li> <li>▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide</b></p>	<p>0</p>	<p>This will be done upon development of CRF and multi-sectoral plan of action for nutrition.</p>

the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.	<b>evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</b>		
---	--	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
<b>Government</b>	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.
<b>UN</b>	UNICEF is providing technical and financial support to the financial tracking exercise using ‘3 steps approach’.
<b>Donor</b>	
<b>Business</b>	
<b>CSO</b>	
<b>Others</b>	

<b>OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation</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 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 both 2014 and 2015 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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Other aspects of costing, financial tracking and resource mobilisation will be addressed upon finalization of CRF and multi-sectoral plan of action in 2016/2017.</p>

**Annex 1: Details of Participants**

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.		Saida Umarzoda	Ministry of Health and Social Protection of the Population (MHSP)	saida.umarova@bk.ru		Yes
2.		Rahmatulloev Sherali	MHSP	sheralir.ru	934248080	Yes
3.		Atoev Mahmadsarif	Mercy Corps	m.atov@mail.ru	93 8804481,	
4.		Gafurov A. I.	Ministry of industry and new technologies		935816619	
5.		Bozorov A.J.	Tajikstandart Agency	bozorov87@mail.ru	918775253	
6.		Mahmadalizoda A.M.	Committee of youth, Sport and tourism	abdulokaluga@mail.ru	935876000,	
7.		Khairov Kh.S.	Director of republican nutrition center	khairov1@yandex.ru	900908118,	
8.		Yahyokhojaev A. U.	Ministry of agriculture	abbos-1959@mail.ru	928420094	
9.		Kurbonmamadova Lola	Aghakhan Fondation	lola.kurbomamadova@akdn.org	936000067	
10.		Kibebu Kinfu	WFP	kibebu.bera@wfp.org		
11.		Malohat Shabanova	Nutrition program assistant WFP,	Malohat.shabanova@efp.org		
12.		Safarov Sh. J.	Ministry of agriculture	sherali-2009@mail.ru		
13.		Ghoibova D.S.	PHC	gds1960@mail.ru	904554519,	
14.		Aminov O.T.	Pediatric Research Institute	oaminzoda@list.ru	917345411	

15.	Bogodyrova Guli	Public health Institute	guli.hpau@gmail.com	935705775	
16.	Kulov A.N.	Statistic Agency	abduvalinabi@mail.ru	2214991,	
17.	Laura Cimzo	Deputy of the Head of USAID	icizmo@usaid.org	2292405	
18.	Muminova M.M.	Committee of TV and Radio			
19.	Thomas Lux	Head of GIZ	Thomas.lux@giz.de	98888541,	
20.	Manzura Mirsaidova	Nutrition Program manager GIZ,	Manzura mirsaidova@giz.de	987320080	
21.	Masedra Muka	GIZ			
22.	Asomuddinov F.I.	Ministry of health	asomuddinov_fazliddin@mail.ru	907981858,	
23.	Mirzoeva R.	Ministry of fiance,	mruzgul@mail.ru	918687912,	
24.	Abdulloeva S.	Nutrition Specialist, UNICEF	sabdulloeva@unicef.org	939998919,	
25.	Kurbonov K.B.	Ministry of health and social protection	kgarhandy@mail.ru		
26.	Muminova M.M.	Committee of TV and Radio	maxi_1002@mail.ru	901311131,	
27.	Khojaeva M.	Ministry of health and social protection	ma2009@mail.ru	907941412,	
28.	Odinaeva M.	Ministry of economic development & trade	Mohtob_odinaeva@mail.ru	2278504,	
29.	Zarina	Interpreter/Volunteer UNICEF			
30.	Unusov Ilyos	Ministry of economic development & trade			



31.	Rahmatulloeva S.	Ministry of health	sanavbar2010@list.ru	9335058471	
-----	------------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------	--

## Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	<b>How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met</b> since the last Joint-Assessment? Please provide details of the meeting, where applicable, i.e., Technical committee meetings, inter-ministerial meetings, working groups meetings, etc.	7 times (1 for CRF workshop; 2 as part of MCH Coordination Council meetings; and Quarterly country network meetings)
2.	Is your <b>MSP replicated at the decentralised levels</b> ? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.	No
3.	<b>Have you organised any high level event</b> since the last Joint-Assessment? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event organised, i.e., Forum on Nutrition, Workshop for high-level officials, etc.	Yes -High-level workshop on CRF -High-level workshop on food fortification (flour fortification and salt iodisation) -High-level workshop on flour fortification (costing exercise)
4.	<b>Are you planning to organise any high level event</b> in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised	Yes -Nutrition forum (dissemination of Infant and Young Child Feeding formative research, etc.) as pre-event for celebration of breastfeeding week -High-level workshop on SUN (CRF launch)
5.	Do you have identified <b>Nutrition Champions</b> in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Yes Technical focal point of Ministry of Health and Social Protection (MoHSP) – advocating for nutrition in every occasion; educating others within and outside MoHSP about SUN Technical focal point of Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT) – guiding SUN MSP members through the development process of National Development Strategy and Mid-Term Development Strategy (to ensure inclusion of nutrition)

		Technical focal point of Ministry of Finance (MoF) – playing a key role in the exercise of financial tracking on nutrition; providing guidance on budget formulation/allocation process Ministry of Education (MoE) – school feeding
6.	Are <b>Parliamentarians</b> in your country engaged to work for the scale up of nutrition in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Parliamentarians for nutrition.	Yes Pushing for the legislation on flour fortification
7.	Are <b>journalists and members of the media</b> involved in keeping nutrition on the agenda in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the media and journalists for nutrition.	No
8.	Is there any reported <b>Conflict of Interest</b> within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	No However, some competition exists between MoE and MoHSP with regard to who to lead school feeding programme.
9.	Do you have a <b>Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy?</b> (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	No
10.	Do you use the <b>SUN Website</b> , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes (for some people) or No (for most of the people) Language is the barrier. SUN Website should be available in Russian as well.
11.	To <b>support learning needs</b> , what are the preferred ways to: – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange?	Both. For the first approach to be more effective, more Russian documents need to be available on a timely basis (e.g., before Country Network meetings)
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with <b>humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility?</b>	No
13.	<b>What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities</b> would be most useful for your country? i.e. federal, emerging economies, maturity in the SUN Movement, with double burden, etc. (for potential tailored exchanges from 2017 onwards)	Grouping is not useful. By mingling with countries with different background and different maturity in the SUN Movement, we can learn better.

**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.

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

<p>✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence</p>			
<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p><b>Development of CRF and multi-sectoral plan of action as well as its costing – external support is needed</b></p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p><b>Development of a communication strategy and package for journalists in order to ensure adequate and appropriate media coverage of nutrition</b></p> <p><b>Development of a nationwide nutrition campaign to focus on 1,000 days – external support may be needed</b></p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p><b>Development of a strategic plan for decentralization of SUN movement, which will also facilitate the increased collaboration with private business, grass-roots organisations, and population (e.g., farmers) directly – external support is needed</b></p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <p><b>Development of a strategy that aims to empower community, including young girls, in promoting nutrition</b></p>

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

---

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

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