

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Name of Country: KENYA

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

April 2015 to April 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016¹ were compiled from stakeholders, and to what extent the process was useful to in-country stakeholders, please provide us with the following details:

Participation

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

Group	Yes (provide number) / No (= 0)
Government	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? _____

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

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?

- Participants had a better understanding of the process and discussions were held that helped gain a common understanding of progress made.
- Reflecting about progress made is the best way to think about how to frame and improve on future action

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

Process 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

- Strengthened coordinating mechanisms at national and sub-national level enable in-country stakeholders to better work for improved nutrition outcomes. Functioning multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral platforms enable the delivery of joint results, through facilitated interactions on nutrition related issues, among sector relevant stakeholders. Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms (MSP) enable the mobilisation and engagement of relevant stakeholders, assist relevant national bodies in their decision making, enable consensus around joint interests and recommendations and foster dialogue at the local level.

Progress marker 1.1: Select / develop coordinating mechanisms at country level

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordination mechanisms are established at government level and are regularly convened by high-level officials. It indicates if non-state constituencies such as the UN Agencies, donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement) Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator Convene MSP members on a regular basis Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other 	3 (Nearly completed)	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft strategy SUN roadmap in place Discussions ongoing for the endorsement of food and Nutrition security bill 2014 3 All SUN networks meeting held in 2015, with monthly SUN technical working group meetings being convened All Six networks well established and functioning with clear terms of reference and annual work plans Joint activity matrix developed and assessed for 2015. 2016 Joint activity plan developed <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UN Network has held meetings both formally and informally over the reporting period. However with the UNDAF Delivering as One in Kenya from July 2014 to 2018 – this continued to bring together all UN agencies to a common coordination and planning process. UNICEF serves as the Chair for the UN Network while WFP Co-Chairs. The Network has ToRs that guide the operations of the Network and also a work plan i.e. Annual work plans for 2015 and 2016 <p>Donor</p> <p>The network held quarterly network meetings during the reporting period and implemented activities according to the TORs and work plan.</p> <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SUN CSA elections held and new board in place Process of developing CSA Strategic plan almost complete

	<p>types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested]</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting held with county directors which generated renewed commitment to SUN CSA • Regular board meetings held and SUN CSA subcommittee meetings held • Rules of engagement put into place and agreed upon • SUN CSA officially registered as an NGO with a clear mandate <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kenya SUN private sector network established advisory committee which meets quarterly and deliberates on the networks businesses • Tors and 2015/2016 work plans developed • Members of the networks engaged in various thematic and sectoral coordination structures and actions i.e. advocacy, national food fortification alliance, MIYCN etc. <p>ARN (2)</p> <p>Network formed in Nov 2015. Convenor and a 7 member steering committee in place. Membership covers 13 academic and research institutions</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand MSP to get key members on board • Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors • Actively engage executive level political leadership • Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics • Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc. • Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally, and create a feedback loop between the central and 	<p>3 Nearly completed</p>	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More engagement ongoing at the national level to include the Media and the parliamentarians • Engagement of the First lady in nutrition activities for 2015. Nutrition activities integrated in Beyond Zero campaign activities at the county level • Identification of both political media and technical nutrition champions • Advocacy strategy and parliamentary engagement strategy drafted for use • SUN Sensitisation at country level done in 12 counties, with commitments to strengthen multi sectoral engagements and increase investment for nutrition <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UN Network membership remained as six agencies • The network continued to actively engage in advocacy for nutrition including the support of conducting of a National Nutrition Symposium during which the First Lady was the Chief Guest; proactive engagement with other sectors e.g. WASH <p>Donor Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors who are members of the network include; EU, ECHO, DFID, USAID, World bank, BMZ (GIZ) and CIFF; UN agencies and several embassies. • Forged partnership: Joint meetings of the ARD and SUN donor group held. Issues of mutual interest discussed. <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media training sessions held with the aim of increasing • journalists’ knowledge and reporting on nutrition sensitive issues • Awareness creation workshops held at the county level to sensitise MCAs on nutrition issues • The MPTF funding increased to five counties in addition to the six initial ones

	<p>local levels, including community, and vulnerable groups. [Provide examples, if available]</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing activities to set county CSA chapters <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Advisory committee are in the process of expanding and recruiting more members into the network, this is plan for to be accomplished before end of the year. KEPSA, an umbrella body of the private sector in Kenya is also a member of the network advisory committee and will be strategic for the network to use their influence, network and connection to have a broader reach and influence <p>ARN (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network ToR developed and adopted. 2016 work plan ratified by network. Membership covers 13 academic and research institutions
<p>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</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"> Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	<p>3 Nearly completed</p>	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint activity tracing tool developed Tracking of the result, actions and commitments against the Nutrition actions done in 2015. SUN advisory (Network chairs) engaged for SUN decision making at county level Engagement of all the Six networks in all activities done-including – high level engagement, Sensitisation at country level, costing of activities, MSP establishment discussions, country network meeting, and advocacy at both national and county level. Streamlined communication activities across all the SUN networks Technical support to multi sectoral collaboration though the Food and nutrition linkages and SUN technical working group <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition has also been mainstreamed in the UNDAF 2014 – 2018 which all UN agencies are aligned to and serves aa a multi-stakeholder approach The Joint Programme on HIV incorporate nutrition as well as the draft Education policy and where the UN Network members have contributed to the discussions UN Network members have supported the CNAP development where MSPs are defined at county level <p>Donor Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported a full time technical advisor to the country SUN focal point. Participated in nutrition sector coordination forums including the Nutrition Interagency coordinating committee and the Nutrition technical forum. <p>CSA (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in the development of the Advocacy, Communications and Social Mobilisation strategy The SUN CSA is on track on implementation of activities within the work plan CSA members use the platform to agree on priority issues at the national and county levels Participated in and facilitated the drafting and printing of CNAPS in five additional counties

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actively participates in monthly food and nutrition linkages working group at the national level which brings all relevant sectors together with an aim of contributing to food and nutrition policy objectives. <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SUN private sector network is a member of the SUN Country technical committee and also will have representation in the multi-stakeholders platform <p>ARN (2)</p> <p>Conducting assessment to generate priority research agenda. Network engaging with SUN secretariat around scientific priorities in 2016-2020 strategy</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [Supporting documents requested from the latest reporting cycle] 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. 	<p>3 (Nearly complete)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the Joint SUN activities provided on a monthly basis Experience sharing done through meetings (quarterly, Monthly, by annual meetings and through emails. Current discussions ongoing on how to enhance information management at the national level and utilisation of the Nutrition website for information Quarterly information bulletin developed. 2015 country report developed. <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the NNAP framework monitoring of results is undertaken With the UNDAF in place, with a CRF all UN agencies have agreed to common indicators and reporting regularly against them was undertaken UN agencies support the development and implementation of the AWP specifically <p>Donor (2)</p> <p>Participated in drafting framework for Food and nutrition bill and key nutrition meetings nationally and internationally</p> <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in and facilitated the drafting and printing of CNAPS in five additional counties <p>Private sector (2)</p> <p>The advisory committee track and record the progress of the network, this is mainly done through their meeting minutes, and action points are derived and worked on.</p> <p>ARN (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in drafting framework for Food and nutrition security bill
<p>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development</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 	<p>3 nearly complete)</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in quarterly county network meetings Engagement of high level in Nutrition meetings at Global level including Global gathering, World health assembly, Multi sectoral meetings etc. Tracking of commitments ongoing at both Global, national and county level Identification of nutrition champions at county level

<p>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"> ▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All SUN networks Bi annual meeting (representation from all the networks) • Meeting with the parliamentary committee for health and agriculture done to enhance support and engagement <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In developing the UNDAF, efforts made to ensure linkages of nutrition across various outcomes. • Efforts towards the development of a high level MSP in line with the FNSP made. • Ongoing support by different members to CNAPs and MSPs development at county level <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with the MCAs and parliamentarians to ensure nutrition is a key focus area • The country’s first lady and other county first ladies recruited as nutrition champions in order to ensure they rally the cause • Plans underway to ensure nutrition is among the main issues of focus in the county budgeting processes <p>Private sector (1)</p> <p>Supported the link and engagement of some of the politician for the launch of Global Nutrition report</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

There has been good progress made since the 2015 including the high level engagement of the political leaders on nutrition activities, engagement of the media in the nutrition sector, development of nutrition advocates selection criteria and the parliamentary engagement guide, and enhanced advocacy for nutrition at all levels. Formation of the academia and research network has been a plus to help enhance evidence generation at the country level. Despite the achievement, the high level leadership engagement in nutrition activities –for other sectors and top government leadership remains limited Some of the key recommendations and actions for 2016 are

- Structures guidance at the county level on the development/optimisation of the 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 /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
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can inform and guide policy making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations ▪ Reflect on existing policies and legal framework ▪ Existence of review papers ▪ Indicate any nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</p>	<p>4 (Completed)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition well-articulated in the constitution, MTP2, Vision 2030, FNSP and KHSSSP • Review of the Nutrition related policies done and areas of convergence identified • Review of the nutrition action plan action plan ongoing • MSP position paper done and discussions ongoing on multisector collaboration • Discussions on the CIDP and inclusion of nutrition in the CIDP, CHISP and AWP done in 17 counties. • Nutrition well-articulated in the Ending Drought Emergency (EDE) framework, and various plans for agriculture, education, health • Capacity development framework finalised- and discussion ongoing on the solidifying nutrition in the Human resource for health strategy (HRH), and health financing strategy • Supported review of the Budget policy statement, annual sectoral progress review (program and financial) • CNAP finalised in 17 counties, drafted in 13 counties, gaps in 17 counties • study on determinant of malnutrition ongoing to complement existing data on causal analysis and BNA <p>UN network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Nutrition related policies initiated • Support provided for NNAP dissemination and CNAP development and dissemination • Different members support different policies reviews and implementation e.g. Agriculture, HIV, Education, Health EDE, AU Nutrition Strategy etc. <p>Donor (3)</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donor mapping finalised and shared with nutrition stakeholders • Nutrition a core component in key donors strategy- to support nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive programs <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysed and gave inputs to the 2016 draft budget statement • Mapping of CSO’s on-going and the same to be shared during upcoming annual nutrition CSO conference <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The advisory committee shared and reviewed key nutrition documents – the national nutrition action plan, guiding principle for private sector engagement and the BMS act, this is to acquaint and align themselves to these policy documents <p>ARN (0)</p> <p>Network to provide on-going technical support in policy and programme analysis for SUN</p>
<p>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of an updated or new policy and legal framework for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentarian engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality ▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops 	<p>4 (Completed)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A National Nutrition Advocacy, Communication and Social Mobilization (ACSM) Strategy developed • Regional ACSM Strategy dissemination Workshops conducted. • Advocacy and SUN Sensitization sessions undertaken both at National and County levels during which parliamentarians, County leaderships and MCA were sensitized on the importance of nutrition • Nutrition Champions have also been defined in various Counties, • Development of Guidelines for Nutrition Champions and also Engagement with parliamentarians defined. • Development of first lady strategy and linkage to the beyond zero campaign for maternal and child health done • Ongoing discussion on mass drive for nutrition advocates t sustain momentum on nutrition • Jointly defined the nutrition Key support areas for the Cabinet Secretary-Health • Advocacy sessions done with the ministry of education on inclusion of nutrition in school curriculum <p>UN Network (3)</p> <p>Technical and financial support for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing Policy analysis, • ACSM strategy finalisation and the training content , • Advocacy and SUN Sensitization sessions both at National and County levels • Regional ACSM Strategy dissemination Workshops • Identification of Nutrition Champions in various Counties

<p>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"> ▪ 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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of Guidelines for Nutrition Champions and also on Engaging with parliamentarians <p>Donor (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific donor agency Country programme documents have nutrition mainstreamed • Financial support on policy development and dissemination <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Ladies influenced to become nutrition champions both nationally and locally • Media trained and encouraged to become nutrition champions in the newsrooms • SUN CSA part of the national ACSM committee <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private sector part of the ACSM committee • The SUN private sector network has proposed to undertake a comprehensive strategy development exercises where communication and advocacy piece will also be detailed out, • The advisory committee planned to disseminate the key nutrition documents and policy to its wider network members for a common understanding <p>ARN (2)</p> <p>Initiated assessment to determine knowledge and information gaps with a view to build consensus on priority research areas.</p>
<p>Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders - government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners - coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies. ▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality. ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive) 	<p>4</p>	<p>Joint assessment (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition mainstreamed in the key School health policy, School meals Policy guidelines, agriculture policy. Discussions ongoing on nutrition inclusion and relevance in school curriculum • Updating and Finalisation of key policies and Guidelines – MIYCN, MNP • Bill on Workplace support passed in parliament • Enforcement of the BMS act, maternity protection act and food fortification act ongoing • Development the PPP engagement strategy to enhance management of PP and conflict of interest <p>UN network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions have been made in developing and reviewing various policy/legal frameworks for nutrition within the MoH, MoA, NDMA, and Ministry of Educations covering both nutrition specific and sensitive programmes. • Updating of the school health policy, school curriculum review <p>Donor (3)</p> <p>Financial support to development of key strategic documents</p> <p>CSA (3)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p>		<p>Through member agencies- supported the development of the key policy guidelines (technical) in key thematic areas- MIYCN, Micronutrient , Food security , and nutrition capacity</p> <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good breakfast challenge launched. Members working on a concept for a good breakfast package in Kenya Work place support policies already in place, just need to be tracked, reported and scaled up within the private sector Mandatory food fortification policy is a key milestone in reducing micro nutrient deficiency in Kenya, it was led by private sector in conjunction with the government and other key stakeholders <p>ARN (0)</p>
Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks			
<p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation <p>[Please share any relevant reports/documents]</p> <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</p>	<p>2 (ongoing)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operationalisation of Guidelines ongoing Capacity building of counties on existing strategies, policy and guidelines done in majority of counties Follow up and monitoring of actions on going to enhance compliance of BMS and food fortification acts ongoing in partnership with stakeholders <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support has been provided in enforcing various legislation e.g. the BMS Act and Food Fortification laws. The enforcement of these laws is gradually being rolled out. <p>Donor (0) N/A</p> <p>CSA (2) CSOs are involved in building of capacities of subnational teams on nutrition strategies, policies and regulations</p> <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>
Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, 	<p>2 (ongoing)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of the exiting nutrition policies undertaken over the reporting period. Study on the achievement the current progress documenting success commissioned

<p>legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document best practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.</p>	<p>impact evaluations, public disseminations etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</p>		<p>Reporting on compliance on key nutrition legislations ongoing i.e. BMS , food fortification</p> <p>UN (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported review of the existing nutrition policies undertaken over the reporting period <p>Donor(0)</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>CSA (2)</p> <p>Various agencies are involved in documenting and sharing successes and lessons learnt from implementing various projects</p> <p>Private sector (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Kenya SUN private sector network is planning to organise a bigger convening which will bring in most of the businesses/companies in Country and from other regions mainly for cross leaning purposes <p>ARN (0)</p> <p>Plans underway to host a national knowledge and learning platform</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

Kenya Continues to make progress in enhancing the nutrition policy. The government continues to create a conducive environment for all stakeholders to implement, actions across the various nutrition thematic fronts. Some of the key gaps however is the implementation and enforcement of the existing policies. Key recommendations

- Fast track the implementation nutrition legislations
- Boost documents sharing through the central repository- nutrition website and the information working group
- Mapping of county level partners to support the 17 counties with gaps on the CNAP
- Mainstream nutrition sensitive actions across the four pillars
- Enhance nutrition advocacy through engagement of the first ladies –through the first ladies forum.

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

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

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

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to nutrition improvement demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, in particular women and children, benefit from an improved nutrition status. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions². The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed across different sectors of Governments and among key stakeholders through a negotiated process. The existence of agreed common results would enable stakeholders to make their actions more nutrition driven through increased coordination or integration. In practice, a CRF may result in a **set of documents that are recognised as a reference point** for all sectors and stakeholders that work together for scaling up nutrition impact.

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholder groups take stock of what exists and align their own plans and programming for nutrition to reflect the national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews ▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms ▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks 	3	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition well-articulated in the national joint documents-Vision 2030, MTP2 • Review of converge point of the nutrition sensitive policies done • Review of the government related programs for nutrition related sectors as part of the financial tracking identification of joint activities and plans with education, agriculture, social protection • Operation research on going on social protection and nutrition. With the ministry of East Africa engaged • Mapping of stakeholders for all the networks exists • Mapping existing gaps on core nutrition sensitive actions is underway. <p>UN network (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UNDAF is fully aligned to national nutrition relevant policies • ALL UN network partners programmes are also fully aligned to the national policies

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

<p>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>	<p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping of members nutrition activities undertaken • Multi-sectoral analysis on country situation undertaken in long and short rains assessments <p>Donor (0)</p> <p>CSA (3) Mapping of nutrition stakeholders in counties on going CSA members align their project focus within the CNAPs objectives</p> <p>Private sector (2) Done the landscape analysis where potential areas and synergies for nutrition and private sector to work on were identified.</p> <p>ARN (0) Plans underway to host a national knowledge and learning platform On-going assessment of sectoral information gaps with a view to align research conducted</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups³ ▪ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender); cost estimates of included interventions ; cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities 	<p>2 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft sun Road map in place- defining the roles of the key sectors and some of the activities and the roles for the stakeholders • Discussions ongoing on multisector leaning- to identify the best practices and opportunities for further engagements. • Review and discussions on Multi sector coordination ongoing <p>UN network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members contributed to the development and printing of the final M&E framework for nutrition specific interventions mainly. • Members supported the development of NNAP and costing of the same. • Members report regularly against the UNDAF progress and to Treasury and the MoH AWP on progress <p>Donor (0)</p> <p>CSA (0)</p> <p>Private sector (2) This will be done once the membership drive exercise is completed and the key nutrition documents shared.</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>

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

<p>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"> ▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</p>		
<p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement the priority actions. This requires, on the one hand, a clear understanding of gaps in terms of delivery capacity and, on the other hand, a willingness from in-country and global stakeholders to mobilise their technical expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources ▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements ▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level ▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan</p>	<p>2 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different Sectors have sector specific detailed work plans at both national and county level • SUN technical committee and Linkages working group formed. Engagement of education and agriculture at technical level to enhance nutrition sensitive agriculture. • Implementation of Nutrition specific activities ongoing at a sectoral level • Identification of capacities and mapping ongoing • Finalisation of the capacity development framework as a tool to identify gaps and build capacity at national and county level <p>UN (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through UNDAF all members report against common goal and objectives aligned to national priorities • Individual agencies have Rolling working plans- signed with relevant ministries and aligned to the UNDAF and national priorities <p>Donor (0)</p> <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed work plan available at the national level to guide the implementation of activities with measurable targets <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information System (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) 	<p>3 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p>

<p>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>	<p>in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate the agreed indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food security and nutrition information analysis done and shared regularly (Short rains assessment, Long rains assessment, Smart survey, coverage assessment, Bottleneck analysis, etc.) • Nutrition sector preparedness and response plan updates bi annually- based on the seasonal assessment • Common indicators reflected in the EDE framework (resilience) • Nutrition sector responsive to the assessment results to aid in programming and funding allocation/optimisation • Data validation- data clinic done with an aim of linking evidence to action • Data audit done at county level to enhance quality reporting and information management • Nutrition information working group, key in initiating, validating, and dissemination of nutrition information at national and county level • DHS review done to determine Nutrition link with other indicators/sectors and validate against other nutrition relevant information <p>UN (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again UNDAF is the CRF for UN with regular reporting outputs and to date 2 reports have been developed • Programming defined by the information analysis and gaps- seasonal assessment, nutrition specific <p>Donor (0)</p> <p>CSA (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly and annual progress reports available • No cost extension done and approved with a realigned budget3 <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case 	<p>3</p>	<p>Joint assessment (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed plan of assessments done at sectoral level. Though biased towards food security and nutrition • Baseline assessment done for linkage with social protections programs • Disseminations of results done to most of the stakeholders at county level and validation done at the national level

	<p>studies, stories of change and implementation progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information shared through the nutrition website and the nutrition information working group acts as a central repository for all nutrition related information • Cost benefit analysis data and costing of High impact nutrition interventions done. • Nutrition related studies validated by the nutrition information working group, and additional analysis done on the impact or relationship with various nutrition actions and indicators <p>UN Network (2) Evaluations and lessons learnt are undertaken jointly with government and other key stakeholders</p> <p>Donor (0)</p> <p>CSA (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices captured in booklets and disseminated • Advocated to media to effectively cover nutrition specific issues <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>ARN (2) On-going review of national and operational research reports</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

Good progress made on Information analysis, validation and dissemination. Nutrition well-articulated in sectoral plans and results framework and there is ongoing discussion to fast track development of a multi sector nutrition plan at the national level. A task force to support this has been set up. Some of the key recommendations are

- Fast track development of the CRF, and accountability mechanism for engagement with the other sectors

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

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

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

Assessing the financial feasibility of national plans to implement actions for improved nutrition is essential to determine funding requirements. The latter is based on the capability to track planned and actual spending on nutrition across relevant government ministries and from external partners. The existence of plans with clearly costed actions helps government authorities and key stakeholders (e.g. UN, Donors, Business, Civil Society) to align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to provide inputs for costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways including conducting a review of current spending or an estimation of unit costs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions [please provide the relevant documentation] Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation] <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	3 (nearly complete)	<p>Joint assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nutrition action plan costed Kenya costing for the 11 high impact nutrition interventions done with support from UNICEF and WB Support provided to costing of the 17 county nutrition action plans Mapping of the allocations ongoing (donor and Government complete) Supporter costing of nutrition in the 2015/2016 national budgets Annual work plans costed and contribution by the relevant stakeholders defined. <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within UNDAF financial reporting is required every 6 months so all members are obliged to report on this Further all agencies report through treasury of support to sector Member agencies supported costing analysis and tools generation of HINI in Kenya. Costing tool finalised <p>Donor (0)</p> <p>CSA (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costed plans available for implementation <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>Not started tracking cost</p>

			ARN (0)
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 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"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</p>	3	<p>Joint</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenya has a compiled database with all the identified nutrition relevant budget allocations for FY 2002/03 to FY 2015/16. The compilation covers great levels of detail with information on: relevant ministries, departments, programs, source funding (domestic/external), and whether it is development or recurrent expenditure. It also includes a further breakdown by economic classification up to FY 2012/13. For FYs 2002/03 to FY2010/11, the dataset also includes actual expenditures ('executed'). The dataset also contains a dashboard showing trends by ministry on nutrition-specific allocations, nutrition-sensitive and potential to be sensitive. • Nutrition involved in 2014/2015 public expenditure review and 2016/2017 expenditure planning as part of the MTEF • Off budget-donor contribution and funding analysis done for Key nutrition specific and sensitive program support • Printed estimates available on the national treasury website and government printers <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With requirements to report against UNDAF and against Treasury each quarter all members report on actual expenditures • Analysis of financial tracking commenced at national level. Development of a financial tracking tool is underway with support from UNICEF <p>Donor (0)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donor mapping done <p>CSA (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members in various counties have mapped resources available for nutrition against what is required as per the CNAP <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>Not started tracking cost</p> <p>ARN (0)</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 other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, and setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps ▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p>	<p>2 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Overall (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft financial tracking tool in place • On budget Funding allocation known as MTEF process is transparent, • Continuous advocacy ongoing to increase resource allocation at both national and county level <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network members are restricted by availability of development partner funding however priority is given according to the national priorities and needs for life saving interventions in consultation with sector partners • Engagements with Counties for increased allocation of resources for nutrition and on the budgeting processes has been undertaken • WFP has also held meetings on handing over of the SFPs. <p>Donor (0)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donor mapping done <p>CSA (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with counties for increased resources for nutrition ongoing, • Advocacy trainings for county health management teams on budgeting process has been undertaken in some counties <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>Not started</p> <p>ARN (0)</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 	<p>2 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up on commitments at both national and county level ongoing • Follow up on government specific programs ongoing • Advocacy ongoing to enhance commitments. This will be further enhanced in the upcoming GNR launch- under the theme from promise to impact-ending all forms malnutrition by 2030 <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All pledges are turned into commitments unless circumstance beyond the agency control <p>Donor (0)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>CSA (0)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members record all pledges made by the politicians during public events or project launches for follow-up <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>
<p>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</p>	<p>2 (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financing strategy existing under the Ministry of health. Nutrition part of the discussions on the global health financing There has been increase on government resource allocation especially at the county level as reflected in increase in human resource capacity, increase in activity implementation and procurement of supplies in some of the county Nutrition is reflected in the MTEP projection, at both national and county level. For some counties, its reflected in the CIDP, however the allocation is small and only limited to the Ministry of health and education (school feeding and ECD), agriculture (Home economics) Nutrition reflected in the financial plan for EDE Shift in funding from development partners- from short term to long term (3-5years. With more focus on development and resilience <p>UN Network (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For member agencies, this will depend on development partners funding and now with Kenya as Middle Income status this may have an impact on securing more regular funding – however all members are involved I in leveraging and advocating for the required resources <p>Donor (0)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>CSA (0)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Private sector (0)</p> <p>ARN (0)</p>

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

With there has been good progress at national level to track nutrition investment and linking this up to the nutrition plans specifically the national nutrition plan. As evidenced by available data and trend analysis on nutrition financing for both on budget and off budget. The nutrition sector has also noted increase in health investment and consequently nutrition investment at both national and county level and increase in Human resource allocation by the government. However the investments is still low. Key actions

- Fast track nutrition tracking tool validation and sharing of nutrition information with Key stakeholders

Annex 1: Details of Participants (final validation)

No.	Name	Organisation	Network	Email	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Gladys Mugambi	MOH	Government	gladysmugambi@yahoo.com	
2.	Monica Okoth	MOH	Government	monokoth@gmail.com	
3.	Grace Gichohi	MOH	Government	gichohigrace@gmail.com	
4.	Marjorie Volege	MOH/UNICEF	SUN secretariat	mvolege@unicef.org	
5.	Grainne Moloney	UNICEF	UN Network	gmmoloney@unicef.org	
6.	Angela Kimani	FAO	UN Network	angela.Kimani@fao.org	
7.		UNAIDS	UN Network		
8.	Gary Jones	UNAIDS	UN network		
9.	Kevina Wangai	GIZ	Donor Network	kevina.wangai@giz.de	
10.	Wambui Kogi-Makau	UON	Academia and Research	wkogimakau@gmail.com	
11.	Beatrice Gisemba	KEMU	Academia and research	gisemba@gmail.com	
12.	David Mwaniki	ENP Ltd	Academia and Research	dilmwaniki@gmail.com	
13.	Philip Ndemwa	KEMRI	Academia and Research	pridemwa@hotmail.com	
14.	Faith Thuita	UON	Academia and Research	faiththuita9@gmail.com	
15.	Dr Celine Termote	Bioversity international	Academia and Research	c.termote@cgiar.org	
16.	Dominic Dalacha	GAIN	Private sector	ddgodana@gainhealth.org	
17.	Edgar Onyango	ACF	CSA		
18.	Fridah Mutea	IMC	CSA	fmutea@internationalmedicalcorps.org>	
19.					
20.					

Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	<p>How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met since the last Joint-Assessment?</p> <p>Please provide details of the meeting, where applicable, i.e., Technical committee meetings, inter-ministerial meetings, working groups meetings, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three times-All SUN networks, • Monthly Technical working group meetings • One Interagency /inter-ministerial meetings (NICC) and two nutrition technical forum held • Quarterly network meetings
2.	<p>Is your MSP replicated at the decentralised levels? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No)</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.</p>	<p>Yes. .in some counties. Different counties have adopted different coordination mechanisms based on need and availability of stakeholders</p>

3.	Have you organised any high level event since the last Joint-Assessment? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event organised, i.e., Forum on Nutrition, Workshop for high-level officials, etc.	Yes. 2015 GNR launch (Dec), 2015 world breast feeding (August) week, 2015 nutrition week (October)
4.	Are you planning to organise any high level event in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised	Academia and Research symposium, 2016 GNR launch, CSA nutrition annual conference, Multi stakeholder learning forum. Private sector symposium
5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Yes-close to 20. Have champions at both national and county level. We have detailed guide on selection and the role Of the champions, which is mainly advocacy within their capacity
6.	Are Parliamentarians in your country engaged to work for the scale up of nutrition in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Parliamentarians for nutrition.	Partly- advocacy is ongoing. Engaging on food and nutrition security bill ongoing, further engagement will be based on the recently developed guide
7.	Are journalists and members of the media involved in keeping nutrition on the agenda in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the media and journalists for nutrition.	Yes. Already engaged on nutrition sensitive reporting, talk shows, print and social media
8.	Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	None reported. Currently we have the PPP engagement strategy which outlines management of COI
9.	Do you have a Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	Yes
10.	Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes
11.	To support learning needs , what are the preferred ways to: – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange?	Website, Meetings, Workshops, forums , media
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility?	Yes. Already we have interacted with South Sudan and Somalia
13.	What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities would be most useful for your country? i.e. federal, emerging economies, maturity in the SUN Movement, with double burden, etc. (for potential tailored exchanges from 2017 onwards)	Emerging economies, with double burden

Annex 3: Common Priorities For 2016-2017:

The table below provides a basic overview of services available to support SUN Countries in achieving their national nutrition priorities in 2016-17. Please review the list below and record your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, so the SUN Movement Secretariat can better appreciate how to maximise delivery of relevant support.

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

<p>research to inform implementation decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence 			
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Update the existing policy and guidelines – nutrition sensitive sectors ✓ Engagement in MTP 3 development ✓ Policy and budgetary engagements ✓ Strengthen the use of science and research in decision making and policy development- help country refine priority nutrition agenda ✓ Development of a business network strategy ✓ Influencing budget allocation for nutrition across the various sectors 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. ✓ Strengthening knowledge learning platforms- institutionalize the knowledge management and learning – Academia, private sector ✓ Learning from other countries on engagement of the private sectors ✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach ✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness ✓ Development of a guideline on the academia and nutrition- preparing students for the market- opportunity through the KNDI curriculum 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Strengthening coordination with other sectors ✓ Development of the Multi sectoral plan for SUN ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis ✓ Membership drive- Private sectors 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies. ✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes

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.