

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Name of Country: TANZANIA

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

Joint-Assessment Meeting done on 5th May 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise¹

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016² 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	14
Civil Society	2
Science and Academia	2
Donors	4
United Nations	5
Business	2
Other (please specify)	0

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? ___29___

¹ TFNC hosted the one-day exercise on 05/05/2016 at the National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR) with UN-REACH support. Dr. Festo Kavishe, an Independent Human Development Consultant facilitated and wrote the report.

² 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, please attach a photo of it if possible (*see photos at end of report*)

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 **YES**

Why? Because:

1. Opportunity was taken to update on the development of the National Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) for 2016/17-2020/21 with outcome of the Joint -Assessment being an important input into the process of stakeholder involvement.

2. Participants shared experience, information and got feedback on what was happening in the different Multi-Sectoral Platforms (MSP)

3. Joint development, discussion and consensus on annual priorities for 2016/17 is likely to help different MSP in developing their own plans for next year.

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 types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested] 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation of multi-sectoral coordinating structures at all levels completed and functioning with TORs (e.g. High Level Steering Committee on Nutrition (HLSCN) and District/LGAs Nutrition Coordination committees. • SUN Government Focal Point in place and coordinating the multi-sectoral nutrition response including the development of a National Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) for 2016/17-2020/21. • MSP platforms are meeting regularly, the most recent meeting being the SUN Business Network (report attached) and the multi-sectoral technical working group on nutrition. • Coordinators of various platforms already appointed and functioning e.g. PANITA (for NGOs and CBOs), GAIN for SUN Business Network, UNICEF for UN, USAID and DFID for Donors and Prime Minister’s Office – for Government

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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] 	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilisation of new actors and Membership through National Multi sectoral Nutrition Action Plan, new CSO registration and new businesses brought on board through SUN business network • Key sectors and stakeholders identified e.g. Action against hunger brought on board, DPs, private sector, media, academia, parliamentarians, policy makers • Engagement with actors that are specialised in themes like gender, WASH, social protection (TASAF) • Aligned planning/decentralized up to district council level (next task will be taking these efforts up to village level)
Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making 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>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSP involved in developing NMNAP where issues of policy/legal frameworks, CRF and costing have been discussed. • MSP continue to be engaged with multi-sectoral nutrition technical working groups • Councils supported to review and plan multi-sectorally for nutrition. • Relevant stakeholders contribute through annual planning and Joint Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Reviews (JMNRs). • Evidence informed-advocacy done using the 2014 National Nutrition survey results and 2014 Tanzania PROFILES (e.g. during SUN lead group and regional secretariat • Efforts made to link-up with Global systems to contribute to nutrition action and learning e.g. SUN newsletter and SUN learning lot.

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [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>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the Joint Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Review (JMNR) of September 2015 done and available on Research Gate. • Report on April 15th 2016 SUN Business Network Consultation done and will be made available on Research Gate. • For each MSP and JMNRs members report on their progress and implementation of recommendations made in JMNRs are reported. Major challenge is that many reports on own contribution and accomplishments are not strategic or critically presented.
Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups 	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of nutrition into government planning cycles done through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual budgeting guidelines, budgeting code/Medium term Expenditure framework (MTEF) - Annual planning sessions with councils before budgets are made to ensure nutrition inclusion and prioritisation • Political party -level inclusion of nutrition in manifestos as a result of concerted high-level Advocacy efforts. • Engagement of global/regional nutrition champions to keep momentum for example done through prominent persons e.g. Graca Machel. • Integration of nutrition into 2016/17-2020/21 five-year development plan done. • Ongoing briefing of concerned offices to maintain momentum or commitment at high level

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional reforms on-going e.g. Nutrition now a section, not a unit, in local government. Planning to have annual events to further bring high level authorities on board
--	--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	(1) Hosting of Joint Multi-Sectoral Review (JMNR) in September 2015 for over 170 participants from all levels and MSP (2) Involving various stakeholders in the six task teams for the development of the National Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) for the 2016/17-2020/21 period (3) Multi-stakeholder Meetings of the High Level Steering Committee on Nutrition (HLSCN), Steering Committees at district and LGAs and National Consultative groups for micronutrients and IYCF
UN	(1) Technical and Financial support to Government (2) Active participation in JMNR and NMNAP task teams (3) sharing of international experience
Donor	(1) Financial support direct or through the UN (2) Participation in multi-sectoral for a (3) Participation in NMNAP task teams
Business	(1) Active participation in SUN Business Network (2) participation in development of NMNAP
CSO	(1) Bringing the Civil Society SUN Network together (2) Participation in JMNR (3) participation in NMNAP
Others	-

<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)</p> <p>Overall score = 3. Overall bringing people together is being done successfully. Key issue is to document and follow up on agreed actions</p>
--

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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint National Multisectoral Review to analyze implementation of NNS done annually • Analyze, Review FNP and develop mutisectoral NS • Analyze code of marketing Breast -milk substitutes

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

<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of 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</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 	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy at different platforms (HLSCN, NTWG, DPGs, Thematic consultatives, NFFA, MN, IYCN) • Advocacy during Zonal planning and Budgeting • Inservice training to key players in the line ministries • Advocacy through PANITA and other key NGO's
--	--	----------	--

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p>		
--	--	--	--

Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts			
<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) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women 	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Health Sector Strategic Plan IV • Update the National budget guidelines • Update of HIV and nutrition guidelines • Develop Guidelines for implementation of SBCC kit • Update the Nutrition Assessment Counselling and Support(training materials& Job aids) • Circular for budgeting each child to have at least 500TZS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		
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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P&B is operationalized at national and district level • Districts have budgeted 500TZS/child • Established unit of nutrition at PORALG now in operation • Updated and developed Guidelines are in use • Employed nutritionists in every region/district • Regions that are implementing nutrition programs have increased and are enforcing national legal framework • Allignment of donors plans with national plans (Multisectoral action Plan)
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 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. ▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning <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>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National track system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JMNR. • Nutrition Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smart Survey using SMART Methodology • Tanzania Demographic National Survey • Score card (quarterly report –underpilot) • PER done every two years • Joint Government Donor supportive supervision on nutrition programs • Learning through meeting platforms; However we still have <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why? We havent documented on the learning to show what works and not working
--	--	----------	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
Government	Formulation of Policy and Legal Frameworks and Mulit-Sectoral Coordination
UN	Technical and Financial Support
Donor	Financial Support
Business	Provide input into policy formulation and development of Action Plans through SUN Business Network
CSO	Provide ideas into policy formulation and development of action plans
Others	-

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 score = 3. Policy, Strategy, Legal Frameworks, Action Plans and Multi-Sectoral Coordinating structures well in place in Tanzania. Key issue is the low capacity to implement and enforce.

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 actions³. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Nutrition strategy 2011/2016-multisectoral with its implementation plans and undocumented results frame work. ▪ Reviewed Nutrition Policy and its strategy ▪ Draft of NMNAP

³ ‘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>		
<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 encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups⁴ ▪ 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 <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>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of six action plans of the NMNAP which translate the policy into actions in which result framework are embedded ▪ NNS-IP
<p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p>			

⁴ This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process1

<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>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual JMNR recommendations became a priority in the next year and Progress of implementation reported
<p>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information 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 ▪ 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>	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual JMNR recommendations became a priority in the next year and Progress of implementation reported
<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 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 <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>	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DHS survey ▪ HMIS ▪ HBS <p>Impact, outcome and Process nutrition indicators are collected in all these surveys</p>
--	---	----------	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	Multi-Sectoral Coordination
UN	Technical and Financial Support
Donor	Financial support
Business	Participation
CSO	-
Others	-

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 score = 3. Government used the 2011/12-2015/16 National Nutrition Strategy to articulate strategic objectives with some aspects of Common Results. The NMNAP being developed will have a Common Results, Resources, Accountability Framework

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	The Government of Tanzania is developing the Costed National nutrition Multisectoral Plan (NMNAP) of 2016/2021 and is nearly complete
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by 	3	Being reported by the Nutrition-Public Expenditure Reviews (N-PER) planned to be done every 2-4 years as well as the annual Joint Multi-

<p>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>	<p>sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		<p>Sectoral Nutrition Reviews (JMNRs), the last was in September 2015.</p>
<p>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 	<p>3</p>	<p>Scaling-up and aligning of resources has been completed (minimum nutrition package of Tshs 500/child although we still have a huge gap of about 80%.</p>

	<p>resource allocation to nutrition related actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>		
Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>	2/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Government has made a lot of financial investment in Nutrition e.g payment of salaries for the over 180 nutrition officers/focal persons at all levels and all staff at TFNC. However, there have been some delays in disbursing programmatic funds (has not disbursed the money for Q3, Q4 for 2015) even for the basket fund where donors put their support money. Although Non-State actors e.g bilateral donors have made pledges not all pledges have translated into allocations and disbursements.
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term</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 	2	<p>Only short term strategic plans of 5 years have been developed by both donors and the Government of Tanzania (GoT), although in order to reduce stunting at scale and sustainably we need a longer-term perspective.</p>

<p>humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		
---	---	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	Multi-Sectoral Coordination and recurrent financial costs at all levels
UN	Technical support in tracking and financial support
Donor	Inclusion of financial tracking when giving financial support
Business	Not much so far
CSO	Providing financial reports in the annual reports
Others	-

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)
<p>Overall score for process 4 = 2</p> <p>Progress has been slow for process 4. It is proposed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a resource mobilization strategy to support the Costed National Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) to mobilise resources from GoT, Donors and the Private Sector • Revitalize the SUN Donor Network which is not operating optimally • Advocate for mobilization of resources from the private sector to support the NMNAP (UNITLIFE) • Improve Financial tracking for sustainability by through the NMNAP Common Result and Accountability framework

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	President	Felix Brooks Church	SANKU	fbrookschurch@sanku.com	+2555-764769476	Yes
2.	Senior Research Officer (Nutrition)	Dr. Fatma Abdallah	Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre (TFNC)	drfatmak@yahoo.com	+255-778275777	Yes
3.	Nutritionist	Mwita J.M Waibe	Preisdnet's Office - Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government (PORALG)	mwitawaibe@yahoo.uk.com	+255-713233359	Yes
4.	NPP.FSN	Stella Kimambo	FAO	StellaKimambo@fao.org	+255-755536799	Yes
5.	PhD Student	Ann Louise Lie	University of Oslo	a.l.lie@sum.uio.no	+255-788839741	Yes
6.	Research Officer (Nutrition)	Adeline Munuo	TFNC	adelinemunuo@yahoo.com	+255-754448636	Yes
7.	GAIN Country Representative & SUN Business Network Coordinator	Enock Musingizi	Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) & SUN Business Network	musinguzi@gainhealth.org	+255-673144147	Yes
8.	Economist	Sarah Mshiu	Prime Minister's Office (PMO)	smshiu@yahoo.com	+255-719539330	Yes
9.	Assistant Director, Nutrition Services (ADNS)	Dr. Vincent Assey	Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Children & Elderly	vdassey@gmail.com or vassey@moh.go.tz	+255-755429911	Yes

10.	Senior Agricultural Officer (Nutrition)	Ruth Kuandika	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF)	ruthkuandika@yahoo.com	+255-754382130	Yes
11.	Nutrition Manager	Biram Ndiaye	UNICEF	bndiaye@unicef.org	+255-787600114	Yes
12.	Research Officer	Samson Ndimanga	TFNC	sndimanga@gmail.com	+255-784832494	Yes
13.	Managing Director	Pauline Kisanga	COUNSENUth (National NGO)	md@counsenuth-tz.org or pkisanga@hotmail.com	+255 682892386	Yes
14.	Technical Adviser (Nutrition)	Tumaini Charles	Fhi360/FANTA	tcharles@fhi360.org	+255-713299683	Yes
15.	Professor (Food Science & Nutrition)	Joyce Kinabo	Sokoine University of Agriculture	joyce_kinabo@yahoo.com	+255-754431324	Yes
16.	Project Officer	Anna Kilale	DFID	a-kilalae@dfid.gov.uk	+255-767820121	Yes
17.	Executive Director	Tumaini Mikindo	PANITA	tumaini.mikindo@panita.or.tz	+255-719676646	Yes
18.	Research Officer (Nutrition)	Catherine Kinalad	TFNC	Ketik69@yahoo.com	+255-688426300	Yes
19.	Senior Research Officer (Nutrition)	Maria Msangi	TFNC	maria_msangi@yahoo.com	+255-754288656	Yes
20.	Lecturer	Dr. Bruno Sunguya	Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS)	sunguya@gmail.com	+255-685217272	Yes
21.	Research Assistant (Sociology)	Josephine Manase	TFNC	Josephinemanase@hotmail.com	+255-714144445	Yes

22.	Nutritionist	Rogers Wanyama	WFP	ROGERSWANYAMA@WFP.ORG	+255-686923598	Yes
23.	Senior Research Officer (Nutrition)	Deborah Charwe	TFNC	mischarwe@yahoo.co.uk	+255-713694719	Yes
24.	Health Adviser	Lisha Lala	DFID	l-lala@dfid.gov.uk	+255-784221887	Yes
25.	Principal Community Development Officer	Julitha Masanja	Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children	juliemasanja@yahoo.com	+255-713365050	Yes
26.	Project Officer (Nutrition)	Janeth F. Said	USAID/TZ	jsaid@usaid.gov	+255-755355393	Yes
27.	Acting Managing Director	Dr. Joyceline Kaganda	TFNC	jkaganda@hotmail.com	+255-784729181	Yes
28.	PPO	Joyce Ngeba	UN-REACH	joyce.ngegba@wfp.org	+255-753482291	Yes
29.	Facilitator/Independent Human Development Consultant	Dr. Festo P. Kavishe	UN-REACH	festo.kavishe@gmail.com	+255-787254631	yes

Annex 2: Focus Questions: (responded to only by the Government MSP)

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.	Both the HLSCN and the Technical Working Group have met at least twice
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.	Yes, there are multi-sectoral steering committees for nutrition at District/Council

		Level and one at Regional Level proposed as priority during the SUN Joint-Assessment
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, the Second Tanzania Joint Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Review (JMNR) in September 2015 which attracted more than 170 participants.
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	Yes, planning to organise the Third JMNR in September 2016
5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	NO
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 have a caucus. The major impact was to incorporate nutrition issues in the Polical Party manifestos for the October 25 th 2015 Elections
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 are invited to high level events and sometimes specific events are organized for them like the one organised by UNICEF in January 2016 to discuss the Lancet evidence on Breastfeeding.
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	Yes, completed and awaiting to be launched.
10.	Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes, the SUN website is very useful to get information about what the SUN is doing, but more importantly it shares information and practices from different countries. It is easy to navigate, so no suggestions at this point.
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?	Both are important depending on the issue
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility?	NO at this stage
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, maturity in the SUN Movement and with double nutrition 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 research to inform implementation decision-making 	<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 	<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>✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence</p>	<p>support the scale up of implementation.</p>		
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country: Priorities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalize the development of the five-year National Multi-sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) (2016/17-2020/21) cost it and include a common results, resources and accountability framework – Ongoing to be completed by June 2016, no support required from SUN. 2. Develop regulations from the TFNC ACT to enable TFNC meet the current nutrition legal needs/environment – No support required from SUN 3. Strengthen and document best practices and lessons - Technical support for capacity development required. 4. Operationalise the use of the Tanzania Nutrition Score Card at all levels – no support required from SUN 5. integrate nutrition indicators in the HMIS at all levels – Under-way, no support required from SUN 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalize the national advocacy plan and briefs targeting specific groups – support needed to mobilise resources 2. Operationalize advocacy strategy – support needed to mobilise resource 3. Adapt and scale up Social, Behavioural Change Communication (SBCC) kit in all regions – support needed to mobilise resources 4. Advocate towards the GoT increasing resource allocation to nutrition including possible nutrition tax of extractive industries (Advocacy support from SUN needed) 5. Advocate for donors to support nutrition more with timely 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen effective community engagement on nutrition (<i>SUN to share best practice</i>) 2. PO-RALG to issue directive to Local Government Authorities (LGAs) to co-opt District Nutrition Officers (DNOs) and Regional Nutrition Officers (RNOs) to become members of the Council Health Management Teams (CHMT)/RMHT (Regional Management Health Team) and participate in sectoral and multisectoral planning process at Regional Secretariat (RS) and LGA level – No support required from SUN 3. Strengthen involvement of Regions, Councils and partners (CSOs, NGOs etc) in nutrition planning process – No support needed from SUN 4. Expand nutrition interventions in CCHP and improve quality of nutrition interventions in health and key sector services – support required to mobilise resources 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accelerate implementation of the “nutrition conditioned” cash transfer of the Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF) program to cover all households below the food poverty line – No support required from SUN 2. Strengthen linkages between nutrition programs and livelihood enhancing projects like TASAF, SMIS, SAGGOT, HR (No support required from SUN) 3. Use human rights and equity approaches in the development of the National Multi-sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) 2016/17-2020/21 (No support required from SUN) 4. Invest more to promote the affordable and locally relevant interventions such as breastfeeding and locally available children’s foods including complementary

<p>6. Use the annual Joint MultiSectoral Nutrition Reviews (JMNR) to present results on coverage of high impact interventions (<i>SUN support required in analysis and reporting</i>)</p>	<p>disbursement of pledges (<i>Advocacy support from SUN</i>)</p> <p>6. Learn how other country governments allocate resources to nutrition (<i>SUN to share best practice from other countries</i>)</p>	<p>5. Develop human resources capacity plans for nutrition at all levels – <i>No support needed</i></p> <p>6. Recruit district nutrition officers for the 38 Councils that currently do not have – <i>No support needed from SUN</i></p> <p>7. Enhance on an ongoing basis the capacity of LGAs in planning, budgeting and implementation of nutrition programs – <i>no support needed from SUN</i></p> <p>8. Incentivise private sector to avail affordable nutritious food products (<i>Can the SUN help with tools to measure?</i>)</p> <p>9. Create Regional Multisectoral Nutrition steering committees just as it is at District/Council level to ensure linkage between the region and the districts/Councils and improve coordination of the committees at all levels (<i>No support required from SUN</i>)</p>	<p>foods (<i>No support required from SUN</i>)</p> <p>5. In implementing the NMNAP priorities first the regions with high numbers and prevalence of under nutrition (<i>No support required from SUN</i>)</p>
--	--	--	---

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

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

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





