

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2017

Name of Country Kenya

**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	Yes
Civil society	Yes
Science and academia	Yes
Donors	Yes
United Nations	Yes
Business	Yes
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? **41 Persons (14 Men and 27 Women)**

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



IMG_20170523_114
021.jpg

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

Why?

The meeting provided an avenue to share experiences, new members were able to better understand the SUN and the Joint Country assessment processes and there was an overall motivation to work together to scale up nutrition. Networks also interacted/networked and learnt how each network was functioning. It was a good opportunity to further chat the way forward in enhancing SUN in Kenya.

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"> Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structures in place and functioning, such as a high-level convening body from the Government (political endorsement) Official nomination of a SUN Government Focal Point Appoint Focal Points/conveners for key stakeholder groups, i.e. a donor convenor, civil society coordinators, UN focal points, business liaison persons, academic representative Convene MSP members on a regular basis: please provide the number of meetings for each identified coordination structures 	3	<p>GOK Network(3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Nutrition Interagency Coordinating Committee (NICC) in the Ministry of Health continues to serve as the MSP and has met once over the reporting period. Further an ALL SUN Networks meeting was held during which all the SUN Networks were represented. The country has a structure for the MSP proposed in the Food and Nutrition Security Policy 2012 (FNSP) that has

<p>donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ Establish or refine the terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements <p>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, work-plan or Supporting documents requested)</p>		<p>been already been signed making it legal. The proposed coordination structures in the Policy upon roll out will pave way for the establishment of a high level nutrition MSP. A Food and Nutrition Security Bill that awaits parliament enactment will further legalise these proposed coordination structures while the FNSP Implementation Framework under development will pave way for the roll out of these structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country has an active SUN Focal Point who is the Head of Nutrition in Kenya and is from the government. The other SUN networks all have specified convenors in place and a secretariat with the exception of the donor where there has been a recent transition. <p>Business network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SUN Business Network is operational, has a steering committee and they meet on a quarterly basis. • The Network is however struggling with keeping the membership vibrant. Plans are under way to have a membership drive. <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UN Network continues to function well. • UNICEF continues to serve as the Chair while WFP Co-Chairs.
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Network has a ToRs that guide the operations of the Network and also has a work plan for 2017 Sensitization on SUN and on MSPs establishment undertaken in counties <p>CSA Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic plan completed awaiting launch Two new SUN CSA chapters for Homabay and Mombasa counties were established 2 board meetings have been held SUN CSA subcommittee on resource mobilization held Ongoing activities to set county CSA chapters for Kilifi, Kwale, Siaya counties and others.
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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand MSP to get key members on board, i.e. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors Actively engage executive-level political leadership Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, WASH etc. Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women’s leadership Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally (please provide number of existing 	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>MSP Membership and involvement of specialised groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is currently broad and has different membership including parliamentarians, media, Line ministries are also on board Engagement of specialised groups is ongoing; at the lower level of government in the counties where different actors like Maendeleo ya Wanawake are on board

<p>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>	<p>decentralised structures if applicable, and Terms of Reference if they exist)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. (Provide examples, if available) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At National level the specialised groups are interested and have been approached to join the SUN movement. Human rights groups, private sector alliance have actively been involved in supporting different legislations on protection and promotion of breastfeeding and workplace support for breastfeeding mothers. National committee on infant feeding is another group specialised on infant feeding that has membership in the SUN movement in Kenya. • The parliamentarians and politicians are actively engaged in pushing for bills and are involved in enacting laws to support breastfeeding • Her Excellency The first lady of the Republic of Kenya is engaged as the patron for nutrition in the country • At county level different patrons and champions have been identified this have mainly been county level first ladies • Plans are underway to appoint SUN focal points to support the counties on SUN related activities <p>Business network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a plan to expand the SUN Business Network (SBN). There is a strategy in place detailing how the
---	---	--

			<p>network intends to operate and maximise its potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding to implement the SBN strategy is a challenge. <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UN Network membership remained as six agencies Active follow up and support to high level advocacy efforts including support to the launch of Global Nutrition Report 2016 during which Her Excellency The First Lady of the Republic of Kenya was the chief guest. <p>CSA Network(3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping for Private sector actors to be initiated 4 New members enlisted and to be unveiled during the next membership meeting Partnership with Global Citizen network to increase media engagement and advocacy work established Media training sessions held with 25 journalists with the aim of increasing knowledge and reporting on nutrition sensitive issues Mapping for CSO undertaking nutrition in Mombasa County done Regular engagement with the parliamentary health committee
Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)			

<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision-making processes and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work plans ▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy and legal documents, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. ▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders ▪ Get platform to agree on agenda/prioritisation of issues, such as deciding which nutrition problems to emphasise, choosing between possible nutrition actions, or prioritising target regions or groups for actions, among others ▪ Use results to advocate/influence other decision-making bodies ▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	2	<p>GOK Network (2)</p> <p>Delivery of Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is county specific with counties being supported to harness their strength. Examples are like in the coast region there is a focus on value addition to the coconut plant, Embu or eastern region the focus is on support for Banana value addition, North Eastern on Meat preservation etc. In addition working with the different networks to identify partners in identifying partners with specific areas of specialization in the Nutrition sensitive sectors • SUN stakeholders have participated in the review and/or development of key documents including the school health policy, ECD policy , national curriculum review process, School meals guidelines, Health Lifestyles and Diets guidelines • At the assessment stage every year the movement has been active in identifying priority areas of focus for each year. Key advocacy activity and high level advocacy events are jointly planned <p>Business network(2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The private sector network has been very active in participating in the SUN stakeholders forums. It actively contributes to the SUN agenda in Kenya.
---	---	---	---

			<p>However, implementation of the agenda within SBN is a key constraint due to funding gaps</p> <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UN Network has been engaged in discussion and the development of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation framework which outlines Multi sectoral coordination structures for nutrition. <p>CSA Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SUN CSA is on track on implementation of activities within the work plan CSA members use the MSP platform to agree on priority issues at the national and county levels
Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the Multi-Stakeholder Platform, as a whole, to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis) Existence of newsletters, activity and monitoring reports of the MSP or the nutrition coordination system (please share, if available) 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. 	2	<p>GOK Network (2)</p> <p>Reporting on proceedings and results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nutrition sector has a website and different communication channels (Facebook page, twitter handle, WhatsApp platform, group email account) in place. All these platforms are used to pass information and share reports to the membership and the country at large. Challenges are around keeping the website active. There is no one person (Communication specialist) dedicated to this role so there are times when

			<p>there are delays in providing updates on the website.</p> <p>Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The newsletter is already proposed and plans are underway to revive and make the newsletter active. • During the year Kenya faced a drought emergency. A lot of efforts on reporting were focused on the emergency. There have been various appeals and reporting on the drought situation and the response. This reporting is on going • Financial tracking of commitment from the donors and the government is being done. <p>Business network (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No real implementation has begun so nothing much to report or track. There are plans in place but it all depends on availability of funding for implementation <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN agencies support the development and implementation of the Annual Work plans (AWP) specifically and review of performance is supported both by GoK and UN agencies • The UN agencies align their plans to the National Nutrition plan of action • Supported the development of a financial tracking tool for nutrition
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertook a nutrition budgets analysis on allocations and expenditure for six counties and at national level <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported and facilitated the costing, the drafting and printing of CNAPS in 3 counties
Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the Government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover Institutional commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups 	2	<p>GOK Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition agenda and objectives are considered in the MTP planning and implementation process and in the county planning processes. The MSP being recognized in the food and nutrition security policy is an advantage for the nutrition sector. Further in the upcoming Medium Term Planning III (MTPIII) planning process it is expected that the MSP will be factored in the National planning mechanism. <p>Involvement of executive level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is continuous involvement of governors and MPs in the scaling up of nutrition activities. Engagement of Permanent Secretaries, Members of Parliament, and Members of County Assembly is ongoing. In Koibatek in Baringo county the county government has given several bee hives to community through the government budget to support livelihoods

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is institutional commitment to the agenda on nutrition and the development partners are continuously funding programmes with a focus on nutrition <p>Business network (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is good will from the private sector senior leadership however engagement with the political class is limited. • KEPSA would be ideal in steering the engagement with political class however KEPSA has not been very active in the SBN agenda or as a member. Plans are underway to link the SBN with KEPSA in a strong way so as to have the agenda of political and public engagement realised <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts towards the development of a high level MSP in line with the FNSP are being made. • The UN has supported the development of key planning documents and has continued advocacy to ensure high level endorsement of key actions that promote nutrition <p>CSA Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with the County assembly health committees and parliamentarians to ensure nutrition is prioritized
--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS		
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.	1) Please can you explain if you are engaging with the humanitarian partners? How? Do you face any challenges?	<p>The nutrition sector has existing nutrition and food security coordination mechanisms like Kenya Food Security Steering Group (KFSSG), Kenya Humanitarian Partnership team (KHPT), Inter Sector Working Group; Emergency Nutrition Advisory Committee (ENAC). The coordination structure have strong leadership</p> <p>Challenges</p> <p>Other sector coordination mechanisms are not as strong, so it slows down our effort to scale up Nutrition and achieve in emergency context from a multi sectoral point.</p>
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS you have in place:		
Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement	<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>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>No specific assessment taking place because within government we are guided by the charters and rules of engagement. There is need for tool to guide such assessment on engagement</p> <p>Inherently the government and the partners all uphold equity, rights of women, men and children. These are the guiding principles under which we operate though no assessment has been done</p> <p>Compliance of stakeholders to the SUN principles of engagement is promoted and there is follow up during the meetings.</p> <p>At the moment no structured compliance monitoring. It would help if there were tools for doing this</p> <p>Members of the SUN CSA facilitate humanitarian work</p>

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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

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)

Progress in the efforts to Bring people together for nutrition continued in 2016. All the SUN Networks were formed and functioned well. However, the Donor Network was faced with convening challenges at some point in the year following transition of key staff in the network. Membership and engagement of specialized groups in SUN has also progressed especially in Counties while at national level the momentum is picking up. Good progress was made towards establishment of high level Multi-stakeholder platforms for nutrition at both national and county levels including supporting Counties to establish County level MSPs; continued advocacy for the enactment of the Food and Nutrition Security Bill and finalization of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework. Further nutrition financial tracking has been undertaken and a tool developed. Some of the key recommendations and actions for 2016 include:

- Continue efforts towards establishment of nutrition MSPs at both national and county levels
- Roll out of the nutrition financial tracking multisector coordination mechanisms
- Continued/heightened advocacy to enhance high level commitment

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"> Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations Reflect on existing policies and legal framework Existence of review papers Indicate any nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislation analysed</p>	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Stock take of Policies and regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Nutrition sector has been active in steering and creating guidelines and policies to guide implementation. A stock take is always ongoing on the processes. In the past year various nutrition specific and sensitive policies and guidelines were rolled out e.g. Food and Nutrition Security Policy, School Health policy, Capacity Development Framework and Advocacy, Communication & Social Mobilization strategy, Healthy Diets & Lifestyles guidelines, BFCI guideline, policy summary statements, MIYCN counselling cards etc. All these were developed/reviewed through a consultative process through various meetings with partners and stakeholders. Currently the country is in the process of reviewing the National Nutrition Action Plan 2012 (NNAP) and a plan

			<p>has been developed to guide the process which will be very consultative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of some policies is a challenge due to lack of guidelines on how to implement some interventions like the institution feeding recommendations. • Engagement of counties to ensure they are seconding nutrition staff to other sectors that are nutrition sensitive like agriculture or education is ongoing <p>Business network (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The business environment in Kenya requires that business comply with the available policies and regulations. Therefore the private sector must keep updated with any regulations or policies coming up so as to guide their operations. <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UN is supporting the review of the current NNAP and the development of a new NNAP. • Support to the development of the Food and nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework is on-going. • UN Network has continued engagement with the government to roll out the Food and Nutrition Security Policy. • Consultations with Government are underway to develop a revised Agriculture Sector Development Strategy. <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support review and formulation of CNAP and NNAP • Plans are to initiate the budget analysis process with two counties towards informing policy review to set stage for resource allocation.
--	--	--	---

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 parliamentary 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"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Existence of a national gender equality and women's empowerment strategy ▪ 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 ▪ Develop a common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy-making that is pro-female ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote the gender-responsive integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, social media outreach, workshops ▪ Dissemination and communication of policy/legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p>	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Advocacy Communication and Social Mobilization strategy has been completed and roll out to counties is underway. • National gender equality is in the constitution and there is a National Commission on Gender which is an indication that the country prioritizes gender issues. • The process of review the NNAP and the development of the FSNP IF is very inclusive and consultative to ensure quality • Continuous advocacy is ongoing on matters of nutrition e.g. on MIYCN to bring men on board because of their influence on achievement of our goals • A team of parliamentarians has been sensitized on matters nutrition and they are championing nutrition issues in Parliament. In various parliamentary committees we have a nutrition champion. • Her Excellency, The First lady of the Republic of Kenya and some County First Ladies act as patrons for nutrition in the country. Other nutrition champions have been identified in the country and these include some media personalities and heads of finance in Counties. Nutrition professionals also work to champion nutrition issues in various work places. • There have been various workshops and engagements to scale up nutrition during which advocacy for nutrition is undertaken. <p>Business Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy formulation process is usually very consultative and especially when a specific policy has

			<p>effect on private sector then there is consultations and engagement in development e.g. the fortification guidelines</p> <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support provided to the MOH for the development and dissemination of the Advocacy, Communications and Social Mobilization (ACSM) Strategy. This included provision of a consultant to support with the development. • Development of Guidelines for Nutrition Champions and also on Engaging with parliamentarians has been supported. <p>CSA Network (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Media documentation and reporting provided. • SUN CSA part of the national ACSM committee and Technical Working Group.
Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts			
<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"> ▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries I.e. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines/advice/support for mainstreaming nutrition into sectoral policies. ▪ Key stakeholder groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition-related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ 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 	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country has a breast milk substitute's bill. The regulations for the bill were developed and this was a milestone in this year for the country. • The breastfeeding workplace support group is in place. It brings together various stakeholders like Central Organization Trade Unions – Kenya (COTU), Federation of Kenyan Employers (FKE), KE, Standards department (KEBS) and different partners to work together is a big step towards ensuring that the breastfeeding is supported and promoted at the workplace.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies that are nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ 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 ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, etc. <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition Inter agency coordinating committee (NICC) is a committee that offers technical and sound advice to different stakeholders and on relevant policies and issues affecting nutrition in the country. <p>Business network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of some policies that directly impact on the private sector have had the private sector being directly involved in a consultative multi stakeholder consultations. Examples include Maternity leave policy, work place support, KNFFA is private sector led. This process have been very consultative <p>UN Network (3)</p> <p>The network has contributed technically and financially to the review and development of various policies, guidelines and strategies. This has included provision of staff and/or consultants to support and contribute to the processes; supporting the convening of stakeholders sessions to contribute to the documents; advocating for the development of the documents; provision of evidence or technical content; printing of documents; supporting the validation, dissemination and launches of documents; supporting the implementation of resulting documents among others.</p> <p>CSA Network(3)</p>
Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforce the legal frameworks			
This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation ▪ Existence of national/sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation 	2	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Existence of National Guidelines to operationalize legislation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country has various national guidelines in place to operationalise various legislations e.g. Breast milk substitute bills we have the regulations and committees

Substitutes, maternity and parental leave laws, food fortification legislation, they right to food, among others.	Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence (relevant reports/documents) of law enforcement		<p>to support and enforce the legislation; the food fortification act is operationalized through various standards and guidelines. The guidelines and regulations are meant to serve even at sub national level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The right to good nutrition is also well enshrined in the Kenya Constitution 2010. To realize this right, the country has in place various nutrition guidelines and/or policy statements and strategies cutting across all the nutrition programmes e.g. micronutrients; MIYCN, Emergency responses, monitoring and evaluation, Healthy Diets and Lifestyles; capacity building <p>Business network (N/A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in the roles of Private sector <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support has been provided in facilitating enforcing various legislation e.g. the development of regulations for the BMS Act and standards for the Food Fortification laws. The enforcement of these laws is gradually being rolled out. Development and roll out of various guidelines, policy statements and strategies across the nutrition programmes have been supported. <p>CSA Network (N/A)</p>
Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact			
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning 	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Learning and sustaining policy and legislation impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition sector has a well-structured monitoring and evaluation system that is coordinated through the Nutrition Information working group. Under this SMART surveys are implemented; DHIS data reviewed; integration of nutrition data into national data collection

<p>available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the Multi-Stakeholder Platforms.</p>	<p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</p>		<p>systems e.g. KDHS fostered; programme specific studies conducted and the dissemination of all these findings facilitated through various fora e.g. the National Nutrition Technical Forum and County Nutrition Technical Forum; Kenya Food Security Meeting (KFSM); study/survey reports posted on the nutrition website; during workshops etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been studies being done around the legislation on universal salt iodization and findings of this are shared • Nutrition is part of the integrated phase classification (IPC) for food security. This reports are shared widely and help the country make decisions on implementation and response • The SUN Academic Research Network held a learning forum within the year. This forum contributed to mutual learning and peer review of various actions and programs <p>Business network (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing happening on this yet but there is plans to organize a bigger convening which will bring most of the businesses/companies in Country and from other regions mainly for cross leaning purposes. All this is subject to availability of funding <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial and technical support provided to the functioning of many of the National and County Nutrition Technical Forums and knowledge sharing events. • Financial and technical support provided to the SMART surveys, KDHS's; MICS; enhancing the DHIS; researches that generate evidence on nutrition all of which help
---	--	--	---

			<p>enhance the monitoring and evaluation of nutrition programmes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical contributions and engagement to the establishment of the proposed National Information Platform for Nutrition. <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMART survey done for Homabay County and result used for programing <p>Academia and research network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academia Network has held a learning forum that was well attended. Always sharing and publishing reports and studies that encourage learning
--	--	--	---

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

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	1) Are mitigation measures clearly integrated in nutrition relevant policies and legal frameworks?	Yes, in the National Nutrition Action Plan the strategic objective 4 is on contingency planning and emergency. Contingency planning is a mandatory annual process. There are national and county level contingency plans. Further, the Ending Drought in Emergencies (EDE) Framework is the overarching national document taking care of Emergency preparedness and the NNAP is aligned to the EDE Framework.
--	--	--

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

Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the parliamentary Nutrition Champions Hon. Sabina Chege has brought forward a bill on breastfeeding called the “Breastfeeding mothers bill”. This has gone through a second reading in parliament. • The launch of the Global Nutrition Report 2016 was undertaken at a high level event with Her Excellency The First Lady of the Republic of Kenya as the chief guest. During the launch she reiterated her support for nutrition. In attendance was the Cabinet Secretary Health; Chair Health Parliamentary Committee; Donors; UN Agencies Heads; All SUN Network Chairs; representatives from the Social sector ministries and the media among others. • Launch of the 2016 World Breastfeeding Week (WBW) had very high level attendance among them MPs, trade UNION COTU, Federation of Kenya Employers, Media coverage. Prof Chepkwony’s speech during the breastfeeding week and he talked about breastmilk being a medicine • Participation in the TICAD: - we had the Ministry of Health Cabinet Secretary Dr. Cleopha Mailu championing for nutrition during the meeting. This was a very high level meeting and being featured in the agenda was a great opportunity and platform to advocate for nutrition to world leaders. • The private sector regularly analyse the policies that have been developed and launched. In doing this they try to identify if the policies are sensitive to private sector needs and in what way they affect the private sector
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>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)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking nutrition commitments is done. • Nutrition financial tracking has been undertaken in 6 Counties and at National level. Further a Nutrition financial tracking tool for nutrition has been developed and will be rolled out in 2017. • In the current drought emergency there is a tracking tool and if the commitment is from government there is a follow up memo with the commitment. Structures are in place to track on any commitment made during meetings or appeals • Formation of the workplace committee came after a commitment during the WBW. A report is made with action points that are followed up.

	<p>they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound (SMART).</p> <p>Please share any available evidence of commitments made since the beginning of 2016. Kindly note that the evidence could be looking at new commitments made or changes to existing commitments, to make them more SMART.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An annual work plan that is costed is another tool used to track commitments
--	---	--

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Two
Government	
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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)
<p>The country has been very active in reviewing and developing policies relevant to nutrition. To operationalise these policies and legal frameworks guidelines have been developed consultatively across all the nutrition programmes. To ensure coherence, consultative meetings with partners and stakeholders have been held during the review and/or development processes of nutrition policies or guidelines. The advocacy, Communication and Social Mobilization strategy launched in 2016 continues to guide the engagement and sensitization of various stakeholders like parliamentarians and media personality both at national and county level. Follow up on the finalization/enactment of key nutrition and food security documents e.g. the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework and the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Bill, Health Bill and Breastfeeding Bill was proactively undertaken. This has seen the sector gain support for relevant policies and legal frameworks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moving forward key activities under this process for the year ahead are: support the finalization of the implementation framework for the Food and nutrition security Policy Support the review of the current National Nutrition Action Plan and actively participate in the development of the new national Nutrition Action Plan Advocate and support the finalization of key bills in parliament like the food and Nutrition security Bill, Health Bill and the breastfeeding Bill

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 in particular, benefit from improved nutrition. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions¹. 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"> Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews Analysis of sectoral Government programmes and implementation mechanisms Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping 	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Nutrition Situation Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition situation analysis is in place and is done regularly. The Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) of food security and nutrition is multi sectoral and usually done twice every year during the short rains

¹ '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"> Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions Map existing gaps and agree on gender-sensitive core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		<p>and the long rains assessments. In addition there are constant (monthly) analysis of information reported from the counties establishing current situation for nutrition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an analysis of what other sectors are doing and identification of possible areas for mainstreaming nutrition is undertaken e.g. the sector was involved in the national curriculum review d, The “Njaa Marufuku” program and the cash transfer program Through the existing coordination mechanisms e.g. Technical Working Groups (TWGs), Nutrition Technical Forum and NICC consultations to align action is done Nutrition Stakeholders mapping has been done and is constantly updated. <p>Business network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A landscape analysis was done where potential areas and synergies for nutrition and private sector to work together were identified Current planning on FSNP-IF has left private sector out. Looking into how the FSNP IF development can have the private sector contributing into it if this will be the CRF for Kenya. <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UN Network activities are harmonized under the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and also under the SUN UN Network annual work plan. Regular meetings under the UNDAF and also the Network are held to coordinate activities. ALL UN network partners programmes are also fully aligned to the national policies and the planning
---	--	--	--

			<p>period is also aligned to the government planning period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously the UN Network supported the development of the M&E Framework for Nutrition, this year is focused on supporting the implementation and roll-out. <p>CSA Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping for CSOs supporting nutrition actions done and the majority of CSO
Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups² Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender), cost estimates of included interventions, cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E, capacity strengthening needs and priorities Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF 	2	<p>GOK Network(2)</p> <p>CRF for scaling up nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the costed NNAP 2012 serves as the CRF and it defines the roles of various stakeholders. While the NNAP is largely focussed on nutrition specific interventions, there are some components of nutrition sensitive programming. The FSNP-IF is under development and will serve as our CRF upon completion. It has defined the medium term objectives and long term objectives. We also have clear roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder. There is an agreed upon implementation plan in the FNSP IF that is costed Within the FNSP IF there is a proposed high level structure for coordination at national and county levels. <p>Business network (0)</p>

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

	<p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed.</p> <p>Please let us know if you have used the checklist for quality national nutrition plans in a bid to review your plans</p>		<p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The members have supported the development of the FSNP IF which is geared to be the CRF CSA Network (0)
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 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"> Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work-plans or implementation plan</p>	2	<p>GOK Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Nutrition Capacity development Framework has been developed for the country which details steps towards achieving adequate capacity for nutrition in the country. Further, capacity assessment tools have been developed and the capacity assessment undertaken in 8 Counties – analysis of findings is underway. The NNAP further outlines ways of addressing capacity gaps for nutrition. <p>Business network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports achievement of the National Nutrition action plan which is viewed as the current CRF for the country <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NNAP has been deemed as the CRF in the past year and all actions and programmes of the UN are aligned to the NNAP. The FSNP IF which will serve as the new CRF is still in the process of development <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed work plan available at the national level to guide the implementation of activities with measurable targets

Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information 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 Existence of regular progress reports Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</p>	2	<p>GOK Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition sector has a well-established nutrition information management system that looks into the various data sources namely DHIS, SMART surveys and National level surveys like the KDHS, Kenya National Micronutrient Survey (KNMS) and MICS. The data from the aforementioned sources is managed through the Nutrition Information Technical Working Group (NITWG). Data platforms/databases, dashboards have been set up. Regular reviews of data is undertaken within the sector and also in collaboration with other sectors especially as part of the long and short rains assessments and in the IPC classifications. The civil society is a member of the NITWG and also actively participates in the data collection, analysis and reporting processes. The government has been engaged in the proposed multi-sectoral database for nutrition i.e. the Nutrition Information Platform for Nutrition. <p>Business network (N/A)</p> <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network technically and financially supports the NITWG and the various data collection initiatives. The network has been part of the discussions on the proposed multi-sectoral database for nutrition i.e. the Nutrition Information Platform for Nutrition. <p>CSA Network (N/A)</p> <p>Academia and research network</p>

Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports and dissemination of findings of population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, good practices, case studies, stories of change – especially those that empower women and girls – and implementation progress ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of evaluation of implementation at scale that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly</p>	2	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The population based surveys, KNMS, KDHS, MICs, SRA, LRA are already being done and results widely disseminated in specific launches and/or during meetings, online or through publications. • There is a lot of lessons learned and shared at different forums including global, regional and Country level workshops. • Advocacy is ongoing and is county specific and at national level. Integration to community strategy for BFCI has resulted in many advocacy groups like Mother to Mother support groups <p>Business network (N/A)</p> <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations and lessons learnt are undertaken though these tend to be at individual agencies level <p>CSA Network (0)</p> <p>Academic and research network (0)</p>

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</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Are mitigation/emergency measures implemented in a coordinated way? 2) Is there a minimum multi-sectoral package for emergency that is being implemented? If so, can you elaborate? 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the nutrition sector, we have the Emergency Nutrition Advisory Committee (ENAC) that meets on a monthly basis and more often during emergencies. • Further under the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) there are emergency national level coordination mechanisms (Kenya

alignment of mitigation/emergency measures		<p>Food and Security Steering Group and the Kenya Food Security Meeting) and County level (County Steering Group) that coordinate multi-sectoral engagement during emergencies and nutrition is included in this. There is integration between the various sectors i.e. water, health, education, Agriculture and there are linkages between the sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular stakeholders meetings are held. Information is flows between counties and national level takes place. Reports are produced and shared across the levels.
--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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)
<p>The National Nutrition action Plan has been the common results framework against which government and partners have been aligning to. The Food and Nutrition Security Policy implementation framework (FNSP IF) that is under development is geared to be the new CRF for the country. Both the NNAP and the FNSP- IF have been developed following rigorous multi stakeholder consultations with a clear implementation matrix. The nutrition situation analysis has informed the planning and writing of the FNSP IF and will further influence the development of the new NNAP. The country has done well in assessing the capacity to implement and achieve goals laid out in the NNAP. Recently a Capacity development framework for Nutrition was unveiled and with its implementation, it is expected that achievement of the CRF(s) will be enhanced. Moving forward some key actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan and conduct joint monitoring of the priority actions and monitoring of achievements of the CRF Completion of the Food and Nutrition security Policy implementation framework and rolling it out to the counties Conduct regular evaluation of the CRF to understand its achievement and sustain nutrition impact Continuous advocacy is recommended to ensure all sectors are conscious of the CRF and plan accordingly to achieve its objectives.

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"> Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions (please provide relevant documentation) Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions (please provide relevant documentation) <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	2	<p>GOK Network(2) Nutrition Costing</p> <p>There are costed estimates for nutrition related actions e.g. the country has a costed NNAP and the FNSP Implementation framework under development is also costed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Nutrition costing tool has been developed and disseminated in the country. The nutrition financial tracking tool has also been completed and dissemination is planned in 2017 The stakeholders have documentation shared on their own allocation to nutrition and it is a requirement for partners to report through national treasury on all funding support that has

			<p>been made available. For UN agencies there is a requirement to report bi annually on funding through UNDAF.</p> <p>Business network(N/A)</p> <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The network provided technical and financial support to the development of the nutrition costing tool; conducting of nutrition budgets analysis; undertaking a nutrition cost benefit analysis in collaboration with the World Bank and MOH and developing a Nutrition financial tracking tool. The UN agencies undertake regular donor reporting in line with donor requirements. Further, they report to government on their respective funding support to the government on an annual basis. The network has provided support in the development of costed nutrition action plans. <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported the development of costed action plans in the counties <p>Academia and research network (2)</p>
Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> Planned spending 	2	<p>GOK Network(3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting in the sector is partial. For Nutrition specific this is very well done and regularly however the activities for the nutrition indicators in nutrition sensitive programmes is not very

<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"> ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others. ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending.</p>		<p>clearly reported. Efforts to strengthen this are ongoing. The roll out of the recently completed Nutrition financial tracking tool will help address this gap as it covers both nutrition specific and sensitive interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a cost effective research on Social returns on investments (SROI) on BFCI in urban slums in Kenya and the report showed BFCI is very cost effective. The report is published and available online <p>Business network(N/A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing much is being done on financial truck. No work started <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a requirements to report against UNDAF and against Treasury each quarter all members report on actual expenditures • The UN has supported development of the nutrition costing tool and the nutrition financial tracking tool • Undertook a nutrition financial tracking at national level and in 6 counties. • In collaboration with the World Bank and the MOH conducted a Cost Benefit Analysis. <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member organization have costed nutrition-sensitive and specific interventions with clear cost forecast and timelines <p>Academic and research network (N/A)</p>
Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps 	2	GOK Network (3)

<p>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"> ▪ Government and other in-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p>		<p>Identification of financial sources and gaps for nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mechanism is there through the NNAP and The AWP the financing gap is clearly outlined • Assessment of additional funding need is ongoing especially around emergency and even for regular programs. • For the nutrition specific programs there is regular review and reassessing allocations and gaps • There is a gradual increase in counties funding nutrition with some counties are getting nutrition specific funding with budget lines e.g. Turkana, Kwale, Mombasa, Taita Taveta • Need for a report especially from counties indicating the nutrition budget allocations and expenditures. . <p>Business network (N/A)</p> <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The donor environment has seen a general reduction in funding available for nutrition. While the emergency response funding has been better, it has been delayed and largely inadequate to cover the needs e.g. in the area of blanket feeding However prioritization and resource mobilization to cover gaps is ongoing <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget analysis study planned for designated counties to identify gaps and provide evidence of resource status for focused advocacy.
--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SUN CSA members strengthening partnerships with corporate partners to ensure resource is increased <p>Academia and research network (N/A)</p>
Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities Specific programmes performed by government and/or another in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>	3	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <p>Turning pledges to disbursement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donors are followed up on the commitments that they have made For domestic funding both in counties and at national level programming can be done and this affects disbursement <p>Business network (0)</p> <p>UN Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the UN all pledges are honoured unless there is a circumstance hindering this. For any pledges from donors they are followed up to ensure honouring. <p>CSA Network (0)</p> <p>Academia and research network (N/A)</p>
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions/projections 	2	<p>GOK Network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan of action has projections and it is usually five years. Currently resource mobilization strategy or objective is mainstreamed in most strategy documents Currently the county has seen a stable and increasing domestic financial contributions. Financial contribution from partners and donors

development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.	Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms		<p>for normal regular programming has however been declining</p> <p>Business network(0)</p> <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All members are involved in leveraging and resource mobilization however duration of the funding is pegged on donor fund availability and financial arrangement. • Efforts to ensure multi-year funding are underway and encouraged. <p>CSA Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUN has a resource mobilization committee in place – proposals sent to potential donors • Plans are underway to cost the 5 year strategic plan
---	--	--	--

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

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations? 2) Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how? 	<p>Yes all commitments by partners are known. The gaps are covered by government both national and county</p> <p>Yes they do compliment, they take into consideration existing routine funding and plans for nutrition</p>
---	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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)

Good progress has been made in the country in ensuring that there is a nutrition costing tool that is used to provide cost estimates for any nutrition related actions. The current National Nutrition Action Plan 2012 to 2017 that acts as the country's CRF is costed. Further, the costing for the different activities and actions in the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework under development has been done. Besides knowing how much each nutrition action or activity costs there are efforts to identify the financial sources, coverage and financial gaps in relation to the CRF. This is done through the Annual work Plan creation process that is very consultative. Efforts to follow up on any pledges given are undertaken by the government.

As part of the efforts to enhance nutrition financial tracking, a nutrition financial tracking tool has been developed, a cost benefit analysis (CBA) study in collaboration with the World Bank undertaken and nutrition financial tracking analysis (allocations and expenditure) undertaken at national level and in 6 counties. Going forward in the year, the next steps shall involve:

- Disseminate the nutrition financial tracking tool, CBA study findings and nutrition financial tracking findings at National and county levels
- Support use of the financial tracking tool in tracking finances for nutrition both at county and National level
- Continue advocating and resource mobilization for nutrition including at County government level

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Update the existing policy and guidelines – nutrition sensitive sectors – Was undertaken in the year ✓ Engagement in MTP 3 development – pending - the development has commenced recently and the sector is actively engaging in this process. ✓ Policy and budgetary engagements – was undertaken in the year ✓ Strengthen the use of science and research in decision making and policy development- help country refine priority nutrition agenda – was undertaken during various documents development. Plans are also underway e.g. under the Academia Network to build the capacity of members and stakeholders on how to package research evidence for policy development. ✓ Development of a business network strategy – a draft strategy has been developed ✓ Influencing budget allocation for nutrition across the various sectors – was undertaken in the year and various counties have begun allocating resources for nutrition.

- ✓ Implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies – **was undertaken e.g. during high level events and during the emergency response where consolidated appeals were launched; responses were implemented in a multi-sectoral manner.**
- ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation – **The Cost Benefit Analysis study was conducted in collaboration with the World Bank; communications materials were developed during key launches and high level events.**
- ✓ Strengthening knowledge learning platforms- institutionalize the knowledge management and learning – Academia, private sector – **The Academia and Research network conducted a national nutrition conference titled “Mainstreaming Nutrition Innovations for Sustainable development” in November 2016 during which nutrition knowledge was shared.**
- ✓ Learning from other countries on engagement of the private sectors – **this was undertaken mainly through bilateral consultations and secondary data reviews**
- ✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels – **was undertaken.**
- ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach – **engagement was done at both national and County levels e.g. at national level the Parliamentary Health Committee has been engaged as part of the Senior guest during the GNR 2016 launch and launch of the CSA Strategy. At County level the Members of the County Assembly have participated in in nutrition events and also SUN sensitization and nutrition advocacy events.**
- ✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness- **was undertaken e.g. training to the media was undertaken by the CSA.**
- ✓ Development of a guideline on the academia and nutrition-preparing students for the market-opportunity through the KNDI curriculum
- ✓ Strengthening coordination with other sectors – **various efforts were undertaken e.g. through the Food and Nutrition Linkages working group engagement with nutrition sensitive stakeholders was enhanced; through the Cash Transfers programme engagement with WASH and Social protection sectors was enhanced.**
- ✓ Development of the Multi sectoral plan for SUN – **The development of the FNSP Implementation framework was actively supported which details the Multi-sectoral coordination structures for Nutrition and Food Security.**
- ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs – **a national Capacity Development Framework (CDF) for nutrition was finalized and the capacity assessments commenced at County level.**
- ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis – **The mapping of nutrition stakeholders is an ongoing process in the**

	<p>nutrition sector and was undertaken in the year. Furthermore, the various SUN networks continued to map the membership and contributions of their members in the reporting period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Membership drive- Private sectors – this was undertaken in the year ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies – to enhance equity, nutrition interventions are largely targeted to the most in need populations as guide by evidence e.g. the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) on nutrition and Food security guides the counties or locations most affected by drought and the response is then targeted to these locations. ✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes – The Kenyan constitution provides for this in that of e.g. the balance in gender representation in government is factored in and affirmative action to design programmes that ensure that marginalised populations are represented and participate in the country's development has been provided for. Additionally, during the reporting period various community engagements/involvement were undertaken through community dialogue mechanisms and the inputs considered in programming.
--	--

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

- Continue efforts towards establishment of nutrition MSPS at both national and county levels
- Roll out of the nutrition financial tracking tool and to support the nutrition financial tracking at both national and county levels
- Enhance multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms
- Continued/heightened advocacy to enhance high level commitment to nutrition
- support the finalization of the implementation framework for the Food and nutrition security Policy
- Support the review of the current National Nutrition Action Plan and actively participate in the development of the new national Nutrition Action Plan
- Advocate and support the finalization of key bills in parliament like the food and Nutrition security Bill, Health Bill and the breastfeeding Bill
- Engage in the development of the Mid Term Plan III (MTP III)
- Engage in development of strategies and guidelines geared towards enhancing nutrition sensitive programming including development of an Agri-Nutrition Strategy
- Plan and conduct joint monitoring of the priority actions and achievements of the CRF
- Conduct regular evaluation of the CRF to understand its achievement and sustain nutrition impact
- Completion of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework and rolling it out to the counties

- Continuous advocacy to ensure all sectors are conscious of the CRF and plan accordingly to achieve its objectives.
- Disseminate the nutrition financial tracking tool, Cost benefit Analysis study findings and nutrition financial tracking findings at National and county levels
- Support use of the financial tracking tool in tracking finances for nutrition both at County and National level
- Continue advocating and resource mobilization for nutrition including at County government level

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

None is planned just now.

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.		Florence Mugo	MOH/NDU		Flomugo88@gmail.com		Yes
2.		Janet Ntwiga	UNICEF/MOH		jntwiga@unicef.org		Yes
3.		Caroline Wandu	MOH/NDU		Wanducarolyne@gmail.com		Yes
4.		Daniel Muhinja	World Vision		Daniel.muhinja@wvi.org		Yes
5.		Louis Robinson	DFID		l.robinson@dfid.gov.uk		Yes
6.		Salome Nyakina	MOH/NDU		snyakina@yahoo.co.uk		Yes
7.		Waithira Mirie	UON		mirie@uonbi.ac.ke		Yes
8.		Lillian Karanja	ENN		lillian@enonline.net		Yes
9.		Hellen Okochil	ARN		Hellen.okochil@gmail.com		Yes
10.		Anabay Mumo	WHO		mamoa@who.int		Yes
11.		Sicily Matu	UNICEF		smatu@unicef.org		Yes
12.		Jospine Njoroge	WHO		Joswani2000@yahoo.com		Yes
13.		Carol C Deasmling	WHO		deasmhunaylc@who.int		Yes

14.		Biniy Zachariah	BIO		bzaah@zahholdings.com		Yes
15.		Hearse ogola	IMC		gogoll@internationalmedicalcorps.org		Yes
16.		Sabine Schlueh	GIZ		Sabine.schlueh@giz.de		Yes
17.		Anna-Vanessa Kullanek	GIZ		Anna-venessa.kullanek@giz.de		Yes
18.		Kiniri Ivy Carla	CISP		Ivy.carla.ic@gmail.com		Yes
19.		Ruth Tiampati	USAID		rtiampati@usaid.gov		Yes
20.		Mildred Ivunyu	USAID		mirunga@usaid.gov		Yes
21.		Jane Wambugu	MOALF		chirumbugua@yahoo.co.uk		Yes
22.		Dominic D. Hodana	GAIN		ddg.dana@gainhealth.org		Yes
23.		Mary Mwale	MOALR		mary.mwale@yahoounion		Yes
24.		John Owuor	NIPN		Owourjhn@gmail.com		Yes
25.		Douglas Mayara	MODP		nmdouglas@yahoo.com		Yes
26.		Nganga Naftaly	MODP		gnaftaly80@gmail.com		Yes
27.		Dorcus Mbithe David	KU,FND		dorcusmbithe@gmail.com		Yes
28.		Salome Onyando	PS Kenya		sonyando@pskenya.org		Yes
29.		Dina Aburmishan	WFP		dinaaburmishan@wfp.org		Yes
30.		Charity Tauta	MOH		c.tauta@gmail.com		Yes

31.		Fehme Weiss	BIO FOOD		achveihjredieh@biofoods.co.ke		Yes
32.		Elizabeth Imbo	SHA- Kenya		Elizabeth.imbo@selfhelpafrics.net		Yes
33.		Phyllis Obote	Uniliver		Phyllis.obote@uniliver.com		Yes
34.		Martin Chabi	WHO		mjoseph@who.int		Yes
35.		Simon Kimenju	Agri Food Economics Africa		skimenju@agrifoodeconomics.com		Yes
36.		Richard Mutisya	KEMRI		Rimusya03@gmail.com		Yes
37.		Peter Wathigo	DSM		Peter.watigo@dsm.com		Yes
38.		Fatima Weiss	BIO FOOD		activeingredients@biofoods.co.ke		Yes
39.		Gladys Mugambi	MOH/NDU		gladysmugambi@gmail.com		Yes
40.		Joshua Oluvay	MOALHF-SDA		Joshuaoyohi85@gmail.com		Yes
41.		Dr. Chris Wanyoike	MI		cwanyoike@micronutrient.org		Yes