

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

ZAMBIA

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

April 2015 to April 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

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

Participation

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

Group	Yes (provide number) / No (= 0)
Government	YES
Civil Society	YES
Science and Academia	NO
Donors	YES
United Nations	YES
Business	YES
Other (please specify)	

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? 50 Government – 20, Civil Society --20, Science and Academia – 2, Donors -3, United Nations 3? Business --2

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

Process

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

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

4. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, please attach a photo of it if possible

Usefulness

5. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, would you say that the meeting was useful to participants, beyond the usual work of the MSP?

Yes / No

Why?

 YES Yes this allowed for more comprehensive feedback from the various nutrition stakeholders/sectors in terms of understanding in-country SUN Movement and in gauging our performance during the period under review.

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] 	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Special committee of Permanent Secretaries on Nutrition in place and chaired by the Secretary to the Cabinet. Met once during the reporting period at which Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health was designated Chair for the National Multistakeholder Platform. The National Food and Nutrition Commission is the Secretariat to this special committee being the designated Government Focal Point for SUN. II. The National Multistakeholder Platform met on 15th February 2016 chaired by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health at which a number of resolutions were made and some of which were to be tabled before

			<p>the Special Committee of Permanent Secretaries.</p> <p>II. Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder platforms have been appointed by their respective institutions. (Nutrition Cooperating Partners – DFID/WFP; United Nations Network – UNICEF/WFP Civil Society Forum - CSO-SU; SUN Business Network – WFP; Academia and Research – NFNC; Government Network – NFNC)</p> <p>V. CSOs meet regularly, and networks and collaboration are strong</p> <p>V. Donor group continued to meet on monthly/bi-monthly basis</p> <p>VI. CO-level Donor Network TOR reviewed and validated</p>
--	--	--	---

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Ministry of Natural Resources in particular the Forestry Department has already been identified as one key member to bring on board in the MSP. This will both expand the MSP and the department was identified because of its potential to contribute towards reduction in malnutrition. 2. The District Nutrition Coordinating Committees, the Ward/Zonal Coordinating Committees have been established in the initial 14 districts and Provincial Nutrition Coordinating Committees in the 7 provinces are in the process of being as well. 3. DNCCs interacting with District WASHE Committees 4. Donor network support activities in social protection, with a focus on incorporating nutrition into social protection 5. UN network has developed the Sustainable Framework which includes nutrition, support the government ministries in the development of the Seventh National Development Plan 6. CSO membership expanded from 52 to 63. 7. Different networks have appeared before the parliamentary committees 8. SUN Business Network has been constantly engaged with Zambia Bureau of Standards, NFNC, Zambia Development Agency and World Health Organisation on nutrition 9. Donor network working to advocate to

			<p>government for strengthened commitment to government</p> <p>10. Donor network support activities in social protection, with a focus on incorporating nutrition into social protection</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans ▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. ▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders ▪ Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues ▪ Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies ▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	<p>3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. At the last MSP stakeholders resolved the following a) lobbying to move NFNC to higher portfolio such as office of the vice president to strengthen its coordinating role, b) the need to cost nutrition intervention to identify the resource gap, c) the need to urgently conduct the mapping exercise to facilitate rolling out of nutrition interventions, d)the need to strengthen NFNC structures at the provincial and district levels e) the need to involve the Forestry Department in the Multistakeholder Meetings and f) the need to generate proposals to improve local evidence. II. Donor Group Participation in all MSP meetings III. Donor Group contribution to all government requests for information and participation

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. The five key line ministries of 1st 1000 MCDP and other stakeholders hold review meetings to review annual work plans as well as set priorities for the coming year. II. Donor Network facilitated information sharing of global, regional, and country-level best practices between various donors, as well as between donors and government & civil society
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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Nutrition is a component a of the national development vision 2030. As such it is integrated into the five year National Development Plan as a cross cutting subject matter. NFNC has been tasked by Ministry of National Planning and Development to coordinate development of the input into the Seventh National Development Plan 2017-2021. II. CSO Network has engaged major political parties to incorporate nutrition in their party manifestos III. Donor Network advocating for mechanisms that strengthen commitments to nutrition throughout Government, e.g. emphasizing need for partnership/walking together with Government in terms of investments, inputs into Health Cooperating Partners Group & supporting structures, etc.

			IV. Increased focus on linkages with programmes targeting WASH, adolescent girls, etc
--	--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	- Government through the NFNC coordinated the line ministries and other nutrition players by constantly engaging them using various platforms on nutrition and nutrition related issues
UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UN network has developed the Sustainable Framework which includes nutrition, support the government ministries in the development of the Seventh National Development Plan - Heads of 11 UN agencies have signed a Letter of Understanding on Nutrition that outlines the areas of collaboration and partnership to address nutrition challenges in Zambia; SUN UN Network members work in accordance with this LoU. - Technical & Financial support provided to NFNC for conducting a stakeholder retreat in April 2015 - Convened the network meeting on an ad hoc basis, specifically surrounding specific requests from support by Government - Active participation at the multi-stakeholder platform and other related meetings - Representation of the UN in diverse groups, e.g. SUN Fund Project Steering Committee and other SUN Networks
Donor	Technical and financial support to relevant Government processes and other requests
Business	SUN Business Network has been constantly engaged with Zambia Bureau of Standards, NFNC, Zambia Development Agency and World Health Organisation on nutrition
CSO	- CSO membership expanded from 52 to 63 and the different networks have appeared to the parliamentary committees on nutrition
Others	-

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)

Functional Special Committee of Permanent Secretaries; Strengthened National Multistakeholder Platform with the designation of the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Health to Chair making the MSP to be accountable to government. The DNCC is being replicated to new districts beyond the 14. New partners are also adopting the DNCC approach so that they fit in into the overall national Scaling Up Nutrition. AdHoc Provincial Nutrition Coordinating Committees in place. In order to sustain these structures there is need to formalise establishment of the coordination structures at subnational levels. Line ministries have not broadly internalised SUN at all levels as such the staff movements affect implementation due to gap in understanding for those remaining in the sector. Therefore there is need for continuous orientation in the in country SUN Movement.

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.	<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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFNC Act has been reviewed by the stakeholders of the MSP. A draft bill is waiting for approval by parliament. • The Food and Drugs Act has been reviewed to be replaced with the draft Food Safety and Quality Bill. • The Public Health Act has had portions amended. • Processes of reviewing the National Food and Nutrition Policy and the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan have commenced. There are minutes/reports for the specific consultative reviews • Donor Network inputs into policy level documents, such as NFNC act and parliamentary hearing on nutrition sector

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 policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentary engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower the most vulnerable and disadvantaged (children and women) through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality ▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops ▪ 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>	<p>3</p>	<p>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A national Advocacy and Communication strategy is being implemented through the National Advocacy and Communication Technical Working Group spearheaded by the government network. 2. Government network made appearances before the Parliamentary Committee for Health, Community Development and Social Services, at its sitting in April 2016. Notably the committee lobbied with the parliamentarians to support the Food and Nutrition Bill once it is brought to parliament. The parliamentary committee’s agenda was to review the Implementation and Coordination of Zambia’s Food and Nutrition Policy and Interventions. A report has been generated by Parliament with recommendations on how nutrition coordination and management can be improved. 3. As part of nutrition advocacy, the National Food and Nutrition Commission through its communication department organized a high level meeting with 20 Parliamentarians from the Health, Agriculture, Community Development and Education Committees. This took place in November 2015. The Parliamentarians were oriented on; the First 1000 Most Critical Days Programme, the 2015 Nutrition Profiles of Zambia, and their important roles as parliamentarians in supporting nutrition in their respective constituencies.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">4. Donor Group development of nutrition key messaging script, especially targeting lead up to election.5. Donor network participation in consultations for the sector plans linked to nutrition6. Donor network developed a one page advocacy document
--	--	--	--

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 ▪ 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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Consultative processes in the NFNC Act review resulted in the development of the Food and Nutrition Bill which Cabinet has endorsed. II. Food and Nutrition Policy and the Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan have not yet been reviewed but the processes are earmarked to start in the second half of 2016 III. Donor Network aligned support to national nutrition strategic plans
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,</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 [Please share any relevant reports/documents] <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. The enforcement manuals for SI on the Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes and Food Fortification are in place but are due for review.

among others.			
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.	<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>	2	<p>The Food and Nutrition Policy will undergo a Regulatory Impact Assessment as part of the review process.</p> <p>Donor Network facilitated information sharing on recent research and other relevant Policy studies have conducted e.g. American Institute for Research (AIR) disseminated results of study on nutritional impact of social cash transfers and IFPRI carried out a study on stories of change, both studies can be shared.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
Government	- The Government partners reviewed the NFNC Act and came up with a draft Bill which Cabinet approved as one of the Bills to be presented to the next session of Parliament. Government network will continue to provide leadership in the review of the nutrition policy and other policies related to nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions
UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaboration of the national Food and Nutrition Strategic plan - Elaboration of the National nutrition emergency preparedness and response plan - Advocacy for repositioning NFNC at an overarching ministry, through the Nutrition CP Group - Technical and financial inputs into the 7TH National Development Plan
Donor	Provided feedback to Government and other external stakeholders on strategies and other requests; developed core messaging script for increased advocacy to nutrition
Business	-
CSO	- Engaged political parties in the run up to the elections on including nutrition in their manifestos.
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)

A draft Food and Nutrition Bill has been developed after a series of consultations with stakeholders. Cabinet has already approved the Draft Food and Nutrition Bill. The timely completion of this process largely dependent on when Parliament will resume after the 11 August 2016 elections and nutrition remaining a topical issue in Zambia. The current Food and Nutrition Policy was adopted in 2006 and is earmarked for review this year alongside the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan 2011-2015. The active engagement of politicians especially at parliamentary level has helped to raise the profile of nutrition. The Food and Nutrition Bill could not be presented to parliament because of competing priorities, such as the Constitution amendment bill, among others.

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

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

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

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

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholder groups take stock of what exists and align their own plans and programming for nutrition to reflect the national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.</p> <p>Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews ▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms ▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks 	3	<p>Plans are underway to carry out mapping of stakeholders across the 107 districts in readiness for Rolling out SUN countrywide.</p> <p>One of the recommendations from the MSP was to come up with a common results framework to align actors around nutrition.</p> <p>A results framework for the 1st 1000 MCDP is in place however, there is need for a CRF which incorporates mechanisms for accountability.</p> <p>Donor Network: Push to bring more donors operating within the nutrition space to work within SUN Fund/support initiatives in-line with</p>

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

<p>review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		<p>SUN Donor Network leading the process for redesigning the SUN fund mechanism.</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 groups³ ▪ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender); cost estimates of included interventions ; cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities ▪ 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>	<p>Plans are underway to review the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan 2011-2016 and develop the next NFNSP (2017-2021). Stakeholders will take this opportunity to develop a CRF.</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement the priority actions. This requires, on the one hand, a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources ▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and 	<p>3</p>	<p>I. Under the 1st 1000 MCDP annual work plans are developed by the key line ministries and NFNC as well as other SUN Fund grant recipients. Once the CRF is</p>

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

<p>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>	<p>develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>developed, all partners will be aligned and joint planning of the annual priorities will be facilitated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Donor Network provided support to various Government agencies to implement their workplans. III. The government network is facilitating the formalization of the coordinating mechanism for nutrition from the national level to the sub national level.
<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>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The national monitoring and evaluation technical working group developed the M&E plan for the 1000 MCDP. Partners are buying in on common indicators. This will facilitate common information flow for reporting. ii. Regular reports are generated for the 1000 MCDP but mechanisms are not in place for reporting of inputs from other partner initiatives. iii. Donor Network supported Joint Annual Review to review progress made under for the 1000 MCDP. A number of recommendations were made for improvements.

Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports and 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>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Donor Network participated in relevant stakeholder consultations to generate lessons learned, shared information that was received, and supported Government to utilize information provided. ii. IFPRI supported by donor and government networks carried out a study called “Stories of Change” which highlight who influences policy in Zambia. This study is being used to identify capacity needs of government, and in particular that of NFNC in influencing policy decisions.
<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>			

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	- Government continued to provide leadership towards the development of the common result framework
UN	Through its Sustainable Development Partnership Framework, the UN established a Result Group on Food and Nutrition Security for providing broader/holistic support to government on food and nutrition programmes
Donor	- - Worked to expand pool of donors funding SUN; supported Joint Annual Review; facilitated information sharing and incorporation of best practices
Business	-
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)

Components of the CRF are in place as given in the 1st 1000 MCDP and the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan 2011-2015. However, the accountability component is yet to be developed. Even though the Joint Annual Review has been done by the Nutrition CPs and government, it focussed on the 14 SUN Funded districts and therefore the other stakeholders felt left out and their performance not taken into consideration. Therefore the JAR should encompass all the districts supported on implementation nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions irrespective of source of funds. From the Joint visits that have been undertaken some best practices have emerged but these have not been documented. However, the Communication and Advocacy TWG has prioritised documentation commencing in the second half of the year.

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 World Bank carried out a costing exercise for nutrition-specific interventions. However, this has not yet been operationalized. The government network, with support from donor network has hired consultants to develop a scale up costed plan, building on the World Bank work. As part of
Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending 	2	A budget tracking exercise was conducted for the period 2011-2015 with support from CSO-SUN Alliance to track resource allocation towards nutrition specific and sensitive programmes as contained in the yellow book and other budget

<p>nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others. ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</p>		<p>documents. The findings were disseminated to various stakeholders, key among them were the Special Permanent Secretaries' Committee on nutrition. The findings from the budget tracking formed crucial input into the country's position paper on the Road to Rio N4G summit.</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 resource allocation to nutrition related actions ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The CSO-SUN has carried a study on the investments towards nutrition that will become the basis for advocacy towards increased allocation to this sub sector. This mechanism will further be rolled out to provinces and districts ii. Donor Network advocated for increased number of donors to put money into nutrition via the in-country SUN fund mechanism, with more donors coming in to support SUN priority interventions.

	<p>additional domestic and external resources.</p> <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>	3	<p>Through the Cooperating Partners' Forum and other multisectoral meetings, Donors towards the SUN Fund constantly reviewed progress made in transforming pledges to actual disbursements and this was done in consultation with SUN 1000 MCDP implementing ministries at national level</p>
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy ▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions ▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions ▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide</p>	1	<p>There is no clear cut resource mobilization strategy therefore there is urgent need to develop one and operationalize it.</p>

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

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	- Government has been using the outcome of the budget tracking exercise to lobby for increased resource allocation to nutrition
UN	- Support to broader national advocacy efforts surrounding nutrition
Donor	- Implemented activities to increase coordinated funding to nutrition via the SUN Fund mechanism
Business	-
CSO	-
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)

While NFNC and CSO had made significant progress in budget tracking, collection of information was a challenge as partners were not ready to disclose disbursements towards nutrition. One of the contributing factors is the weak legal framework, which does not give NFNC authority to NFNC to compel partners to report on expenditure on nutrition in the country.

To address this challenge, one of the immediate tasks agreed upon by stakeholders is to put in place a CRF, which will ensure that partners are held accountable.

Another challenge needing immediate attention is the determination of the funding gap for nutrition which should be used for government and partners to pledge resources to nutrition.

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Nutrition Specialist	Ruth Siyandi	UNICEF	rsiyandi@unicef.org	+260 977719129	
2.	Programme Manager	Ethel Yandila	DFID	E-Yandila@dfid.gov.uk	+260 211 251164	
3.	Nutritionist	Mike Mwanza	NFNC	mikemwanza@gmail.com	+260 979158899	
4.	SBN Manager	Ralf Siwiti	WFP/SBN	raphael.siwiti@wfp.org	+260 978779508	
5.	Nutrition Advisor	Emily Heneghan	WFP	emily.heneghan@wfp.org	+260 971238426	
6.	ED	Robinah Mulenga Kwofie	NFNC	rmulenga2011@yahoo.com		
7.	AgroEconomist	Sosten Banda	NFNC	sostenbanda@gmail.com	+260 975226619	
8.	Programme Manager	Humphrey Sikapizye	Save the Children	humphrey.sikapizye@savethechildren.org		
9.	SNR Com Dev	Paul Mboshya	MLGH	mboshya@yahoo.com	+260 977775254	
10.	H/PHCNU	Freddie Mubanga	NFNC	fdmubanga@gmail.com	+260 977805413	
11.	Food Scientist	Gladys Chirwa Kabaghe	NFNC	gladysckabaghe@yahoo.com	+260 966761583	
12.	Nutrition Manager	Hermann Ouedraogo	UNICEF	houedraogo@unicef.org	+260	
13.						

14.						
15.						

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.	MSP met Twice NCPs meet monthly Government network met twice Academia and Research met twice SUN Business Network met four times CSO SUN met seven times
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, see extract from the 1 st 1000 MCDP document
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, (1) Special Committee of Permanent Secretaries for Nutrition Meeting date (2) Orientation of parliamentary committees on Health, Social Welfare, Agriculture and Education
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, in November the country will host a Nutrition Conference
5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Yes these include Parliamentarians (see on 6 below), Chiefs and Church leaders (promoting behaviour change for nutrition improvement),
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; advocating for increased funding to nutrition, food fortification, amendment of the NFNC Act, reviewing of the National Food and Nutrition Policy and increasing the profile of nutrition in sector Ministries.

7.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, Media and journalists were provided with training and orientation on nutrition reporting. After the training, some key activities undertaken by the media include; airing of programmes on nutrition on Community Radio Stations and writing articles on nutrition in national newspapers.</p>
8.	<p>Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?</p>	<p>Yes, some cooperating partners want to implement nutrition activities outside the agreed framework i.e one funding mechanism, one coordinating unit and one M&E. This is not yet resolved.</p>
9.	<p>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</p>	<p>Yes</p>
10.	<p>Do you use the SUN Website, if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?</p>	<p>Yes, no suggestions at this point</p>
11.	<p>To support learning needs, what are the preferred ways to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange? 	<p>Website, exchange visits, documentation of best practices. The SUN Movement secretariat can facilitate this.</p>
12.	<p>Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
13.	<p>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)</p>	<p>The most preferred would be countries maturity in the SUN 1000 MCDP especially those that are more advanced in terms of implementation, and those with the double burden so that Zambia can draw lessons and replicate certain policies and strategies.</p>

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 	<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 	<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) 	<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>Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence 	<p>strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis 	
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF) ☑ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels <p><i>Incomplete CRF has been a limitation to ensure accountability of stakeholders at all levels. The current NFNSP ends this year hence the need to develop another which will be aligned to the Seventh National Development Plan 2017-2021</i></p> <p>Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN)</p> <p>Estimation of costs to implement</p>	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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 <p>External support is required.</p>	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. <i>This is important at subnational level as we strengthening structures at that level.</i> ☑ 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). <p>Required external support.</p>	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p><i>All of the above as this will be necessary to operationalise community engagement strategy</i></p>

<p>actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking.</p> <p>External support is required for all the above.</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.