SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Kyrgyz Republic

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

April 2015 to April 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016[1] 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	In writing and verbally
Civil Society	In writing and verbally
Science and Academia	In writing and verbally
Donors	In writing and verbally
United Nations	In writing and verbally
Business	In writing and verbally
Other (please specify)	In writing and verbally

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	X	Email	
Review, validation	Meeting		Email	X

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?

The meeting was useful as it was a chance to get together and discuss the activities that have been undertaken within the year and challenges, and to define priorities for the future with the aim of improving nutrition and food security in the country.

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.	▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement) ▪ Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator ▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis ▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative ▪ Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure ▪ Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested]	2	• Multi-sectoral platform of SUN movement was established and is being formalized in terms of selection/identification of network leaders: - First lady of KR was selected as leader of science and academia group (October 2015); - Leader of business network (January 2015); - Facilitating agencies of the UN network (WFP, FAO) (November 2015) Civil Alliance was created in December 2014. • It is planned to establish coordinating body –

			Secretariat of the Council on food security under the Ministry of Agriculture and melioration of the KR chaired by First Vice Prime Minister of the KR; • It is planned to make amendments to the Law of KR on "Food security" in terms of changing its title to "Council on food security and nutrition"; • It is planned to sign Memorandum of Understanding between networks

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence			
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).	▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board ▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors ▪ Actively engage executive level political leadership ▪ Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics ▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc ▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally, and create a feedback loop between the central and local levels, including community, and vulnerable groups. [Provide examples, if available]	2	In comparison with the previous year, Multi-Sectoral platform is being expanded with involvement of Deputies of the Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament), Prime Minister's Office of the KR (department on agricultural sector and ecology). It is necessary to engage Ministry of education and science of the KR, Ministry of economy of the KR, Ministry of finance of the KR, State agency on environmental protection and forestry, State agency on local self-governance and inter-ethnic relations, UN agencies, donors and others. Further decentralization of the platform is needed.
Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)			
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.	▪ 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		Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017 was adopted (as of September 4, 2015, # 618), and interagency working group on the implementation of the program was also established. Interagency working group has developed draft resolution of the Government of the KR on "Implementation of the Law of the KR on Fortification of baking flour". Coordination mechanism on food security had been repeatedly discussed at separate meetings and at expert meeting. "Den Sooluk" National Health Reform Program of the KR for 2012-2016 is being implemented.

			State program on prevention and control of noninfectious diseases for 2013- 2020 (as of November 11, 2013 # 597) is also being implemented. Strategy of protection and health promotion in Kyrgyzstan until 2020 (Health- 2020) as of June 4, 2914, # 306 is also being implemented along with other legal acts. Science and academia group has developed a draft Strategy of SUN movement in the KR, undertook review of the events, achievements and challenges in the sphere of food security and nutrition and presented it at expert meetings with the aim of disseminating of data and justification of obligations on nutrition and food security. There was developed a draft for updating the Law of the KR on protection of breastfeeding, clinical protocol and guidelines on prevention and treatment of iron-deficiency anemia among children, women of fertile age, pregnant women and elderly persons.

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments			
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.	▪ 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.	3	Food Security Council is an advisory body, formed by Government of the Kyrgyz Republic and established for taking relevant operating decisions, related to stable and uninterrupted provision of the country with food and measures for improving the quality of nutrition. - Coordinating Council on public health of the KR was created in order to take effective measures, targeted at protection and health promotion in the Kyrgyz Republic, observing of international health regulations by state and non-state bodies. Report on food security and nutrition is submitted quarterly by the state structures. Meetings of development partners in the frame of DPCC are held (Development Partners Coordination Council), UNCT meetings.
Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform			
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.	▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups	2.0	Existing state programs conform to tasks of SUN movement. Science and academia group jointly with leader of the movement promote establishment of the institute for the research of nutrition.

Stakeholders	**Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One**

Government	- Development and adoption of Program on food security and nutrition in the KR for 2015-2017, it is also planned to establish Secretariat of the Food Security Council under the Ministry of agriculture and melioration of the KR; Government ensures the functioning of the Food Security Council of the KR under the Government of the KR and functioning of Coordination Council on public health under the Government of the KR. Representatives of the sector are the initiators of the development of legal acts: drafts of the Laws of the KR, decrees and orders of Government of the KR, decrees of Jogorku Kenesh of the KR (Parliament). - Coordinator of SUN Movement – is the deputy Minister of agriculture and melioration of the KR
UN	- UNICEF and WFP (since January 2015) are the co-facilitators of SUN Movement, WFP and FAO are the facilitators of the UN network for SUN Movement (since November 2015). They actively participate in the activities of the platform, engaging other UN agencies (WHO, UNFPA), provide technical and information support, discuss nutrition and food security issues on donor meetings and other meetings, develop action plan of the UN network on nutrition. UNICEF supports project "Establishing of favorable environment for promotion of nutrition issues", which is implemented by non-governmental organizations; WFP installed equipment for video/tele- conferencing in the conference hall of the Ministry of agriculture and melioration of the KR and provided financial support for unification of modules on nutrition for village health committees and schools and produced Atlas on food security and nutrition. Further coordination of efforts and support to Secretariat of SUN Movement on the functioning of UN network is required. FAO, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, World Bank actively participate in the establishment of Secretariat of the Food Security Council.
Donor	- Projects SPRING/USAID, Agrohorizon/USAID carry out their activities in the form of parallel activities on nutrition, provide expert and technical support, including assistance with the development of clinical protocols and manuals on prevention and treatment of iron-deficiency anaemia among children, women of fertile age, pregnant women and elderly persons. World Bank participates in the establishment of the Secretariat of Food Security Council with subsequent funding.
Business	- Network was formed in January 2016, and its leader and deputies have been selected, it is planned to conduct relevant events. Sector representatives participate in the development of legal acts. They inform business associations about technical prescriptions and instructions, and participate in the monitoring of the observance of the legislation in partnership with other sectors.
CSO	- Civil Alliance actively participates in the activities of the platform and has made a significant contribution to establishment of business network, science and academia sector, engaging Parliamentarians, mass media. It has conducted functional analysis of the coordination mechanism in nutrition and food security, developed website of the platform; arranged various events, information campaigns, radio/TV programs about right to food and nutrition in the Kyrgyz Republic. Members of Civil Alliance implement the project "Nutrition in Mountain Agro-ecosystems" to improve and diversify diet of women and children in remote areas.
Others	- Science and academia sector was arranged, which unites scientists of 6 leading universities of the country (KSMA (Kyrgyz State Medical Academy), KSMATRHR (Kyrgyz State Medical Academy for Training and Retraining of Human Resources), KRSU (Kyrgyz Russian Slavic University), KNAU (Kyrgyz National Agrarian University), KTU (Kyrgyz Technical University), KNU (Kyrgyz National University), National Mother and Child Health Center and National Academy of Science. The leader of the sector was selected – First Lady of the KR. To support leader of the movement, there was prepared justification for the feasibility of establishing the institute for research of nutrition in the country. Clinical protocol on prevention and treatment of iron-deficiency anaemia among children, women of fertile age, pregnant women and elderly persons was developed and approved.

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)
Overall achievements: Multi-sectoral platform of SUN movement is being formalized and all networks have been arranged. Within the reporting period leaders of the science and academia sector have been identified and appointed (First Lady of the KR), and business networks and UN networks have been set up.

Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017 was adopted (as of September 4, 2015, # 618), and interagency working group on the implementation of the program has developed draft resolution of the Government of the KR on "Implementation of the Law of the KR on Fortification of baking flour". The following state programs are being implemented: "Den Sooluk" National Health Reform Program of the KR for 2012-2016, Strategy of protection and health promotion in Kyrgyzstan until 2020 (Health- 2020) as of June 4, 2014 # 306 and other legal acts. Draft Strategy of SUN movement in the KR was elaborated, review of the events, achievements and challenges in the sphere of food security and nutrition was conducted and its results were presented at expert meetings with the aim of disseminating of data and justification of obligations on nutrition and food security. There was developed a draft for updating the Law of the KR on protection of breastfeeding, clinical protocol and guidelines on prevention and treatment of iron-deficiency anemia among children, women of fertile age, pregnant women and elderly persons.
There is good progress towards coordination of food security and nutrition issues, it is planned to establish Secretariat of Food Security Council under the Ministry of agriculture and melioration of the KR, development of its Regulation and other required legal acts (making amendment to the Law on "Food security" in terms of changing the title to "Food Security and Nutrition Council". There started engagement of line department of Prime Minister's Office of the KR and Parliamentarians.
Functional analysis of coordination mechanism in nutrition and food security was undertaken, and the platform developed design and contents of the brochure about SUN Movement, video about SUN Movement, website of the platform was developed, and it is planned to sign Memorandum of Understanding between the networks, there takes place exchange of information about the implemented activities.

Suggestions for improvement:
Further engagement of the Ministry of education and science of the KR, Ministry of labour and social development, Ministry of economy of the KR, Ministry of finance of the KR, State agency on environmental protection and forestry, State agency on local self- governance and inter-ethnic relations is required, as well as engagement of high level political leadership, UN agencies, donors and other actors.
Signing of Memorandum of Understanding, improvement of information exchange and decentralization of the platform.
Secretariat needs support for building capacity of the platform networks, conducting trainings, communications, social mobilization, decentralization of the platform, finalization of national strategy of multi-sectoral platform with identification of target indicators and calculation of costs.

Major challenges:
1. Limited resources, it is required to attract investments in nutrition and tracking of financial resources
2. Promotion of accountability on all levels
3. Understanding and further promotion of nutrition in program documents and policy

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and 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.	▪ 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 **Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations**	3	Analysis of programs, strategies, policy in the area of nutrition and food security is being conducted. Analysis of legal acts in the area of nutrition and food security has been undertaken, as well as functional analysis of the coordination mechanism in nutrition and food security activities. In accordance with the Regulations of Government of the KR, all legal acts pass through the procedure for the alignment between interested ministries and agencies prior to review by the Government of the KR, and undergo legal and other scientific expertise. As per the Regulation, draft legal acts that directly concern the interests of citizens and legal entities, and drafts of legal acts, that regulate entrepreneurial activities, are subject to public discussions by means of placing them on official website of the norm- setting organ.

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

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	▪ 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	3	National communication strategy on nutrition was elaborated (Republican Health Promotion Center). Engagement of Parliamentarians, discussion of the issue on fortification of flour at the "Parliamentarian Day".

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 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.	▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops ▪ Dissemination and communication of policy / legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences **Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies**		

Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts			
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.	▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies. ▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality. ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other **Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts**	2	There exists Regulation of the Government of the KR, Jogorku Kenesh of the KR (Parliament), regulations of ministries, instructions on legislative techniques, in accordance with which there takes place initiation, development and further internal state procedures on legal acts. Key stakeholder groups started coordination of their contributions to nutrition. This was clearly seen during elaboration and adoption of Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017, draft of the Law of the KR on "Making changes and additions to the Law of the KR on Fortification of baking flour".
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 Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.	▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation ▪ Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation [Please share any relevant reports/documents] **Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement**	2	There are mechanisms for observance of legislation; however, separate regulations are not implemented to sufficient extent.

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 best practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.	▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. ▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning **Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports**	2	Such large scale research as MICS (Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey) (National statistical committee of the KR, UNICEF, UNFPA) was conducted, as well as Situational Analysis of children in the KR (UNICEF). Other research was also undertaken such as "KAP survey on micronutrients among adolescent girls, pregnant and breastfeeding women in four provinces of the KR" (Ministry of Health of the KR, WFP, UNFPA, GIZ, and Embassy of Switzerland in the KR). Research was presented to general public. Program on food security and nutrition is being monitored, there is quarterly report. Its implementation was reviewed at the meeting of Food Security Council on 1 April 2016.

Stakeholders	**Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two**
Government	- Initiation, development, promotion of legal acts and its implementation in accordance with regulating documents.
UN	- Analysis of legal framework in the sphere of food security and nutrition, technical support to the platform, advocating of nutrition issues. FAO, WFP and UN Women implement the project on improvement of economic opportunities of women.
Donor	- Analysis of legislative framework in the sphere of food security and nutrition, and ad hoc support (for specific purposes)
Business	- Analysis of existing policy and laws, participation in introduction and promotion of changes in the legislation, informing relevant parties through business associations, State program on food security. Laws on fortification of flour and salt were adopted, and some changes are being introduced. There was held monitoring of salt iodization, and as per the results the round tables are being arranged, test kits were developed for identification of iron in grain products.
CSO	- Public hearings, advocacy, expert evaluation, monitoring, consultations
Science and Academia	- Participation in elaboration of draft State Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017, participation in lobbying of this program through holding meetings, arranging information for politicians about justification of some events, the draft for changes and additions to the Law of KR on "Protection of breastfeeding and regulating marketing of breast-milk substitutes". Draft Strategy on SUN Movement of the KR was prepared based on global strategy and it was presented for discussion to members of SUN Movement in Kyrgyzstan.

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)

Overall achievements:
Initiation, development, expertise, alignment and further norm-setting stage of legal acts is carried out in accordance with Constitution of the KR, Regulation of the Government of the KR, Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament) of KR, Law of KR on "Legal acts", regulations of ministers, instructions on legislative techniques. Analysis of gaps in legislative framework was undertaken.

Suggestions for improvement:
-Regular monitoring of implementation of legislation in the sphere of nutrition and food security
- Further improvement of legal acts, elimination of gaps, collisions of legislation with participation of the platform

Major challenges:
1. Coordination and harmonization of efforts
2. Insufficient understanding of nutrition and insufficient focus on nutrition issues
3. Financial gaps

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

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

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

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to nutrition improvement demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, in particular women and children, benefit from an improved nutrition status. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions[2]. 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. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the	▪ 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	2	Program on food security and nutrition has been adopted, as well as sectoral documents (orders) on the implementation of action plan. Functional analysis of the coordination mechanism in nutrition and food security was carried out. Atlas on food security, which includes nutrition indicators was produced, and mapping of interventions on nutrition might be combined.

[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'

review of programmes and implementation capacities	**Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment**		
Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition			
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.	▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups[3] ▪ 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 **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed**	2	Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017 was adopted. It is planned to develop the next Program for 2018-2022. Draft Strategy on multi-sectoral platform (MP) of SUN Movement until 2020 is being elaborated, with identification of national indicators, roles for each stakeholder group. Technical support was provided to SUN Secretariat for the development of national strategy on multi-stakeholder platform (MSP) and identification of its costs. However, there are some collisions in the legislation and gaps. There are administrative malfunctions during import of non-fortified flour. It is necessary to align technical prescriptions with requirements of the Eurasian Economic Community (EAEC), since Kyrgyzstan is its member. It is required to introduce logical frameworks for scaling up of nutrition interventions.
Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework			

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

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.	▪ 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 **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**	1	Action plan of Program on food security and nutrition is being implemented, but there are some financial gaps in the Program. The table on donor assistance to the Program was produced, and it was discussed on DPCC meetings.
Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
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.	▪ Information System (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate the agreed indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance ▪ Existence of regular progress reports ▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits ▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance	1	Implementation of Program on food security and nutrition in the KR for 2015-2017 is carried out in accordance with the established order with provision of quarterly reporting by the state structures. However, the reporting of other organizations, that are engaged in the Program implementation, is not always observed. Website of multi-sectoral platform is being elaborated. Upon launching of this website, it is planned to enhance information communication within the platform and between the networks.

	▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions**		There is an indicator in the global nutrition report but it is not used for decision-making.
Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.	▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories of change and implementation progress ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes **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**	1.8	Research data is disseminated through its posting on online resources, on round tables and through publication in mass media. Finalization of case-study on maternity wards/maternity homes "The Baby- Friendly Hospital Initiative (BFHI) for 2002-2016. At the same time, there is no sustainability of impact in nutrition. Internet platform NMA (network of mountain agro-ecosystems), which is the functional network (knowledge bank was set up), contributes to the interactions of stakeholders in relation to nutrition sensitive agriculture.

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	- Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017 and action plan of the Program were approved by the Decree of Government of KR #618 as of September 4, 2015.
UN	- Contribution to the development of Program on food security and nutrition, technical and financial support during its elaboration, implementation of actions in the frame of the Program, arranging research in partnership with state bodies.
Donor	- Implementation of actions in the frame of the action plan of Program on food security and nutrition.

Business	- Promotion of programs on iodine deficiency and iron deficiency, inclusion of nutrition issues into business development strategies. Introduction of joint logical frameworks for scaling up of nutrition interventions. Planning of the evaluation of nutrition sustainability. Conducting joint monitoring in partnership with other sectors.
CSO	Civil Alliance enables the promotion of programs and campaigns on promotion of nutrition sensitive agriculture. To achieve this, members of Alliance use information exchange, expert potential on the platforms, where they discuss nutrition issues, there is joint participation in the events and mini-projects. Preparation for signing the Memorandum of Understanding between the networks is in progress.
Science and Academia	- Jointly with the Civil Alliance on improving nutrition and food security, there was elaborated a guideline on monitoring of three Laws of the KR on nutrition (on fortification of baking flour, prevention of diseases related to iodine deficiency and protection of breastfeeding). Informational materials on nutrition issues were produced for the population and decision-makers.

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)

Overall achievements:
Program on food security and nutrition for 2015-2017 and action plan of the Program were endorsed by the Decree of the Government of the KR #618 dated 04.09.2015. It is planned to develop the subsequent Program for 2018-2022, and the multi-sectoral platform of SUN Movement is in the process of elaborating the strategy of multi-sectoral platform (MSP) of SUN Movement until 2020, with identification of national indicators and roles of each stakeholder group.
Technical support was requested from the SUN Secretariat for assistance with the development of national MSP strategy and calculation of its costs. Website of the multi-sectoral platform is under development. Upon launching of the website, it is envisaged to improve information communication within the platform and between the networks.

Suggestions for improvement:
Administrative violations during import of non-fortified flour
Improvement of information communication
Improvement of sustainability impact in nutrition

Major challenges:

Collisions in the legislation and gaps
Financial gap in the Program on food security and nutrition
It is necessary to align the technical prescriptions in accordance with the requirements of the Eurasian Economic Community (EAEC), as the Kyrgyz Republic is its member.

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).	▪ 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] **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans**	1	Calculation of the cost of Program on food security and nutrition was made with breakdown as per sectors and there is a financial gap equal to 44.7%. It is planned to make analysis of budget related to nutrition sphere.
Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for	▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including ○ Planned spending	1	There is reporting on expenditures of state budget and donors track expenses in the frame of their programs and Agreements with the Government.

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.	○ 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. **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending**		
Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls			
This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.	▪ 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	1	The Government and other partners allocate resources for nutrition, but there are no obligations and allocation of funds among individual stakeholder groups

	additional domestic and external resources. **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps**		
Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements			
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.	▪ 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 other in-country stakeholder **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)**	1	There is no stable funding
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
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	▪ 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 **Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide**	1	There is forecast in the frame of program budgets of sectors, but there is no long-term and flexible strategy on mobilization of resources Due to joining EAEC, the economic conditions have significantly changed in the key branches of food industry, which led to major decrease in production levels and sustainability of financing of planned interventions also decreased.

the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.	**evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms**		

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	- Funding in the frame of program budgets of sectors
UN	- Financial and technical support for identification of costs of Program on food security and nutrition, presenting of financial gap on donor meeting with the aim of resource mobilization
Donor	-
Business	- In connection with joining EAEC, the economic conditions have significantly changed in the key branches of food industry, which led to major decrease in production levels and decrease in funding of planned interventions
CSO	-
Others	- There were no activities in this sector

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)

Overall achievements:
Calculation of costs of the Program on food security and nutrition was made with breakdown of costs as per sectors
There is forecast in the frame of program budgets of sectors
It is planned to make analysis of budget in nutrition sphere

Suggestions for improvement:
There is no long-term and flexible strategy for mobilization of resources

Major challenges:
There is a financial gap in the program on food security and nutrition equal to 44.7%
In connection with joining the EAEC, the economic conditions in the key branches of food industry have significantly changed, which led to major decrease in the levels of production and in sustainability of financing of the planned interventions.

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Mr	Erkinbek Chodev	Ministry of agriculture and melioration of the KR, coordinator of SUN Movement, deputy Minister	chodueve@mail.ru	0312662511	Yes
2.	Mr	Jumabek Asylbekov	Ministry of agriculture and melioration of the KR, Head of department of food security and agro marketing	juma52@mail.ru	0312664489	Yes
3.	Ms	Anara Bekkulieva	Ministry of agriculture and melioration of the KR, leading specialist of department of food security and quality	a.bekkulieva@mail.ru	0312626376	Yes
4.	Ms	Baktygul Ismailova	Leading specialist of department of public health under the Ministry of Health of KR	b_ismailova@mz.med.kg	0312665920	Yes
5.	Ms	Jamilya Usupova	Deputy director of Republican Health Promotion Center under the Ministry of Health of KR	jama.usupova@mail.ru	0312300985	Yes
6.	Ms	Sairakul Ryskulova	Member of working group on non-infectious diseases	sayrarys@mail.ru	0700010007	Yes
7.	Ms	Evgeniya Doskeeva	Advisor to Minister of Health of the KR	edoskeeva@mail.ru	0556713139	Yes
8.	Ms	Gulmira Kozhobergenova	Chair of Civil Alliance on food security and nutrition, leader of civil society sector	gulmira-ka@yandex.ru	0772149580	Yes

9.	Ms	Halida Amanova	Secretariat of Civil Alliance on food security and nutrition	amanova1959@mail.ru	0771290291	Yes
10.	Ms	Jarkyn Turusbekova	Federation of organic movement "«Bio-KG"	jturusbekova@bk.ru	0556005911	Yes
11.	Ms	Gulnara Uskenbaeva	President of Association of suppliers (producers and distributors), leader of business sector	info@supply.kg	031289-55-43	Yes
12.	Ms	Baktygul Dzhangazieva	President of Association of salt producers	Kaps3@mail.ru		Yes
13.	Mr	Alexander Shefner	President of Association of bread producers	a.m.shefner@mail.ru		Yes
14.	Mr	Ruslan Bokushev	Operations Manager	rbokushev@kg.mercycorps.org	0772506335	Yes
15.	Ms	G. Adbyrazakova	NGO	protiv.raka.kg@gmail.com	0702174107	Yes
16.	Ms	Aida Dzhamangulova	Agency of development initiatives, NGO	aidajam@mail.ru	0772558007	Yes
17.	Ms	Nazgul Abazbekova	Technical coordinator SPRING/USAID	nabazbekova@spring-nutrition.org	0558355381	Yes
18.	Ms	Nazira Arpachieva	SPRING/USAID			
19.	Mr	Raoul de Torcy	Deputy Representative, UNICEF in KR	rdetorcy@unicef.org	0312611211 (149)	Yes

20.	Ms	Damira Abakirova	Health and Nutrition Officer, UNICEF in KR	dabakirova@unicef.org	0775580241	Yes
21.	Ms	Keiko Izushi	Deputy Country Director, WFP	keiko.izushi@wfp.org	0312322225	Yes
22.	Ms	Bermet Sydygalieva	Nutrition Officer, WFP	bermet.sydygalieva@wfp.org	0559940385	Yes
23.	Ms	Nurjamal Bekova	Consultant, FAO	n.bekova@mail.ru	0555810818	Yes
24.	Ms	Ainura Imanbekova	Chair of Board of council of cooperatives of Kyrgyzstan	Ckk_@mail.ru	0312461365	Yes
25.	Mr	Gijs von den Berg	FAO, UN Volunteer	Gijs.vanderberg@fao.org		No

Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	**How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met** since the last Joint-Assessment? Please provide details of the meeting, where applicable, i.e., Technical committee meetings, inter-ministerial meetings, working groups meetings, etc.	TOTAL: 15 Out of them: Meetings prior to teleconferences –5 Selection of leader for science and academia sector -14.10.2015 Selection of business sector leader - January 2016 UNCT- February 2015 Technical meeting- December 25, 2015 Expert meeting- March 10, 2016 Technical meeting on development of SUN strategy –May 2016 DPCC- on fortification of flour – January 27, 2016 Meeting on financial gap –November 2015 Meeting with Mr Choduev –February 2016 Discussion of country presentation and website – April 2016

2.	Is your **MSP replicated at the decentralised levels**? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.	No
3.	**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 Expert meeting/Forum of multi-sectoral platform
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	Nutrition Forum – June 2016 Meeting with Parliamentarians
5.	Do you have identified **Nutrition Champions** in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Yes, coordinator of SUN movement – is the deputy Minister of agriculture and melioration of KR First Lady Mrs Raisa Atambaeva
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.	Yes They raise issues of food security and nutrition, and plan to consider fortification of flour on the Parliament Day
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 They cover nutrition issues in TV/radio programs, at flash mobs
8.	Is there any reported **Conflict of Interest** within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	No
9.	Do you have a **Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy**? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	Development of Communication Strategy for the first 1000 days of child's life is in progress
10.	Do you use the **SUN Website**, if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes, documents should be available in Russian, it is needed to renew data, and to hold online training in Russian
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?	It is required to share experiences, improve access to information in the sphere of nutrition and on functioning of business platform
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, joining EAEC affected the republic
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)	1) Countries with emerging economies 2) Countries with double burden

		3) Countries with experience in SUN Movement

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
✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents ✓ Situation/Contextual analysis ✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition ✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF) ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework ✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN) Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level) ✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making	✓ 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.	✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multi-stakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. ✓ Support with strengthening capacity of individuals or organization to better engage with: themes (like WASH), sectors (like Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics) ✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others ✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI) ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis	✓ 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

✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence			
Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country: 1) Development of mechanism for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) 2) Support the improvement of data management (for example, national information platforms on nutrition – NIPN). Evaluation of costs for introduction of interventions (on national or subnational levels). Tracking of finances (on national and/or subnational levels) 3) Support the development and holding research for elaboration and collection of evidence	**Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:** 1) Development, updating or implementation of multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies 2) Engaging nutrition champions into positioning of nutrition as the priority on all levels 3) Development of national investment projects, supported by data and evidence with the aim of promoting advocacy on nutrition	**Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:** 1) Prevention and management of Conflict of Interests (KI) 2) Enhancing skills of key stakeholders, such as members of multi-stakeholder platform (MSP). Skills may include communication and negotiations, team building and leadership, planning and coordination 3) Support the fostering capacity of individuals or organizations for improvement of participation in the activities: spheres (such as WASH), sectors (such as education or business) or with stakeholder groups (such as science or academia)	**Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:** 1) Adapting, adopting or improvement of policy, which is targeted at empowerment of women and girls 2) Development or review of mechanisms related to measuring of equity in nutrition plans, policy and strategies 3) Ensuring participation of representatives from marginal 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.