

JOINT-ASSESSMENT BY THE NATIONAL MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PLATFORM,
IN LINE WITH THE SUN MONITORING,
EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEARNING
(MEAL) SYSTEM

2018 REPORTING TEMPLATE



(APRIL 2017-APRIL 2018)

KENYA

About the 2018 Joint-Assessment

We invite you to provide us with the following details, to help the SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS) better understand how inputs into the 2018 Joint-Assessment were compiled by stakeholders, and, to what extent this process is deemed useful.

Participants

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

Group	Yes (provide number)/No (= 0)
Government	1
Civil society	1
Donors	1
United Nations	1
Business	1
Science and academia	1
Other (please specify)	

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 13

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 6 Male and 7 Female

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



IMG-20180613-2.jpg

9

4. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, please attach a photo.



IMG-20180613-3.jpg

9

Usefulness

5. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, would you say that the meeting was deemed useful by participants, beyond the usual work of the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)?

Yes/No

Why?

Yes the meeting was useful because it gave the participants opportunity to update each other on the ongoing works. It was also an opportunity to get updates for how the some networks had been fairing on and also discuss way forward for the networks.

Use of information by the SUN Movement

Please note that this template will be featured on the SUN Movement website, unless the SMS is otherwise notified. Analysed results of this Joint-Assessment will also form the basis of the 2018 SUN Movement Progress Report.

Scoring key

N/A	Not applicable	Progress marker not applicable to current context
0	Not started	Nothing in place
1	Started	Planning has begun
2	On-going	Planning completed and implementation initiated
3	Nearly completed	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational

4	Completed	Fully operational/targets are achieved/on-going with continued monitoring/validated/evidence provided
----------	------------------	---



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

Coordination mechanisms or platforms enable stakeholders to better work for improved nutrition outcomes. These platforms can serve to bring together a specific stakeholder, or they can be multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral platforms (MSP), with a broader membership, and may help to link stakeholder-specific platforms. Platforms can exist at both the national and sub-national level, with the two levels often being linked. MSPs are seen as operational when they enable the delivery of joint results, on issues relevant to nutrition. MSPs are also deemed functional they enable the mobilisation and engagement of relevant stakeholders, assist relevant national bodies in their decision-making, spur consensus around joint interests and recommendations, and foster dialogue, at the sub-national level.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

This progress marker looks at the presence of both stakeholder-specific and multi-stakeholder platforms or mechanisms, and how they are linked. The platforms that now focus on scaling up nutrition may have either been developed from existing mechanisms, or have created recently, and specifically, for this purpose.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

The CSA has held quarterly meetings consistently

Has shared workplan

Has had a streamlined and coordinated communication channel where there is an updated contact list for the members

Existing structures at sub national level with CSA chapters

CSA working on getting a website platform that can link the members virtually for good coordination.

The CSA has been having scheduled phone calls to help with coordination

Gaps

Lack of common monitoring system for the CSA

Govt (3)

There is an appointed SUN Focal person. Currently still housed under the Nutrition unit within Ministry of Health

The government network has a workplan guiding their actions. All this is in support of the wider Common Results Framework
There is the Nutrition Inter Agency Coordination Committee that meets twice a year and it is Multi sectoral
The completion and signing of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework Provides an Opportunity for strengthened and more structured Multisector coordination in the country. The FNSP IF has been endorsed by all relevant sectors and the county government which gives it legitimacy for implementation

At county level seven counties have established Multi sectoral Platforms for Nutrition and food security coordination. These have Terms of Reference and they are in the process of formulation their Common results framework.

SBN (2)

The SUN Business network has been active albeit with few members. The active members have been participating in the Sun activities. The first quarter of 2018 a technical committee has been formed that is working to reorganize the way the business network works. The network also received a node to get a coordinator from the TAN support and recruitment process is ongoing.

Academia (2)

The network is in existence and has common priorities identified. It has a secretariat and terms of reference that guides their actions

Donor(1)

This network has been inactive as a network but the donors have individually been participating in SUN activities

UN (3)

The UN Network continues to function well holding its meeting regularly.

UNICEF continues to serve as the Chair while WFP Co-Chairs.

The Network has a ToRs that guide the operations of the Network and has a work plan for 2018

Sensitization on SUN and on MSPs establishment undertaken in counties

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence

This progress marker looks the internal coordination, among members, achieved by the multi-stakeholder platform. It also looks at efforts to increase collective influence by engaging new actors and stakeholders, resulting in expanded membership. This can encompass sub-national platforms or actors, grassroot-focused organisations, or the executive branch of government, for example.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

Membership has been growing through the year and diversity in terms of the kind of membership being attracted

Sub National level chapters are beginning to take shape with 9 counties having the SUN chapters in the last one year. There are 47 counties in Kenya so not all counties have taken up the SUN agenda clearly. Multi sectoral engagements are taking place at sub national level and this is not necessary done as standalone engagement for the CSA network

The CSA is part of the Multi sectoral Platform and this forms a platform for engagement and working together. However individually the CSA has not been strong on engagement with Private sector but this is changing gradually for specific activities that they engage in.

Government (3)

The government network was reactivated this year and this brought on board various sectors like Trade, Devolution and even the Bureau of Statistics that were usually not part of the membership.

At Sub National level this engagement has continued and the networks are strong and this led to well-coordinated efforts during the response to drought emergencies that hit the country during the year under review.

At Sub National Level we have various Multi- sectoral platforms being convened by governors, First ladies or the county first ladies. This has led to growing legitimacy of the MSP and to ensuring convening power

The network led the country team in participating in the SUN global meeting

SBN (3)

With the formation of the secretariat new members have been brought on board and the technical committee is comprised of neutral members that are not in business. The state department of trade, KEPSA, Kenya association of manufacturers are very active in the network

Academia (2)

The network has continued to attract more membership. For the second half of the year the network has been inactive. Members have however been actively participating in the nutrition sector activities

Donor (2)

This network has remained silent in growing its membership. They currently lack a convener

UN Network (3)

The UN Network membership remained as six agencies

Active follow up and support to high level advocacy efforts like marking of nutrition day WBW and planning for the nutrition days in country.
The UN Network has also been active with global commitments and participating in the global UN Network

Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)

This progress marker looks at whether the MSP fosters collaboration among stakeholders, at the national level, on issues most relevant to the nutrition agenda, in addition to commitment and follow-through. When relevant, interactions at the sub-national level should also be addressed.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (2)

The CSA has been very strong on engaging in the Multi stakeholder platform. Being the network that is very involved in implementation of actions for the nutrition sector, the CSA have been at the forefront in taking up prioritized agendas for the nutrition sector in Kenya.

The CSA has been engaged in the various action both at National, sub National and has been very present in any MSP forums

Government (3)

The Networks has been very keen on following protocol and using laid out regulations and legislation on matters nutrition. This year a review of the previous National Nutrition Action Plan was done and the process of developing a new action plan for Kenya has been started.

The FNSP IF was completed in the same year and this gives priority actions that will be taken to adverse Food and Nutrition Security

At Present the NICC that functions as the MSP for nutrition in the country is guided by the country's legal framework and keeps a check on implementation of nutrition actions across different stakeholders

Not all planned activities are funded therefore limiting implementation of the common results Framework

SBN (2)

The business network action has been guided by NNAP. There is a constraint on funding because the network has not received funding as a network until recently in the first quarter of 2018 when it received TAN support.

GAIN the convener has however been funding different SMEs in their efforts to provide safe and nutritious foods to the population. All this have helped advance the scaling up nutrition agenda.

Academia and Research (3)

The members of the network have consistently attending the MSP forums and they participate in guiding prioritization for nutrition actions. The network members have been active in identifying capacity gaps

within their network and beyond and have worked together to identify and implement solutions to the identified gaps

UN Network (3)

The UN Network has been engaged in the development of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation framework which outlines Multi sectoral coordination structures for nutrition.

The UN Network participated in the review of the NNAP 2012-2018 helping the country identify the gaps within the implementation of nutrition actions and is now involved in development of the new NNAP

UN Network has been keen on resource mobilization for identified gaps and was involved during the drought emergency appeal and response

Donor (2)

The Network has taken up national priorities as agreed upon by the NICC and they participate regular in the MSP forums.

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and reflect on own contributions and accomplishments

This progress marker looks whether the MSP tracks and reports on implementation of agreed actions, by individual actors and stakeholders, and their contribution to the MSP's collective progress towards agreed priorities. The MSP's ability to foster accountability is also considered.

FINAL SCORE 2

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the [progress marker explanatory note](#) for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (2)

CSA members have been reporting in their individual capacities and within different working groups. The tracking as a team still has challenges in that collective tracking is not in place.

In the quarterly meetings, there is opportunity for feedback mechanisms and presentations that give a forms of monitoring which later is aggregated into a report for what the CSA is doing collectively

Government Network (2)

A review of the previous Action Plan that worked as the CRF for Kenya was done at end term This gave various learning points, members highlight need for regular review and monitoring to track implementation actions.

At individual level stakeholders constantly report on actions taken in fulfilment of their actions. There is however need for development of monitoring and tracking plan for the CRF especially now that the new plan of action NNAP 11 and FNISP IF are both beginning implementation in this year.

Reporting and racking for achievement on nutrition specific actions has been well taken care of using various platforms like the central DHIS, Nutrition website and even surveillance. Reporting for nutrition sensitive actions is not very well done or tracked

Accademia and Research Network (2)

This network has overseen the majority of research activities that are undertaken to track results and status. Reports and tracking is however desegregated and individually done as pieces of work and not collectively.

The network has also published some of its findings including documenting reports and disseminating the same to a wider network

SBN (2)

Monitoring and tracking for results has not been systematic in the business network. Most reporting on results is individual based on specific actions by different business and to their donors or funders. There is need for a common monitoring approach for the over all work plan

UN Network (3)

UN agencies support the development and implementation of the Annual Work plans (AWP) specifically and review of performance is supported both by GoK and UN agencies

The UN agencies align their plans to the National Nutrition plan of action

The UN agencies have supported the dissemination of the financial tracking tool and supporting counties to adopt the tool for tracking nutrition financing

Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform

This progress marker looks at the extent to which a multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is accepted as a national priority and institutionalised by all stakeholders.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (4)

This has worked well especially at Sub National level, there has been engagements with different county level governors and other personalities at this level

The inclusion of Nutrition in the big four agenda for Kenya was a big gain and a confirmation that the government and high level authorities appreciate the role of nutrition in national development

Government network (3)

Sustaining gains made in the Nutrition advocacy is an ongoing effort. This year seven new MSPs were formed at county level and various county level advocacy forums have been done

Several counties now have budget lines for nutrition with money being allocated to nutrition in Five counties.
 At national level the budget allocation to nutrition is glowing.
 Inclusion of Food and Nutrition Security in the governments agenda for the next five years is a big win for SUN
 The first lady of the republic continues to be the patron for the SUN movement in the country and this has led to sustained advocacy efforts for Nutrition country wide.
 In the devolved system of governance in Kenya various County First ladies are also taking up the role of being champions for good nutrition at the county level

Academia and research Network (2)

Business Network (3)

The network has sustained the push to advocate for increased commitment to nutrition amongst the stakeholders.
 KEPSA has been at the forefront of championing for protection of breast feeding and adoption of workplace support.
 In the passing of the current health bill, KEPSA was instrumental in pushing for and including workplace support in the bill

UN Network (3)

Efforts towards the development of a high level MSP in line with the FNSP are being made.
 The UN has supported the development of key planning documents and has continued advocacy to ensure high level endorsement of key actions that promote nutrition
 UN has sustained the call for high position for nutrition with the president being identified as a global champion for youth and nutrition

Donor Network (3)

This network has sustained efforts to sustain high level recognition and acceptance of Multi sectoral and Multi stakeholder approaches to Food and nutrition agenda. Different donors have endorsed and accepted the role of Multi stakeholder approach and they are championing it

Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process 1

*As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).*

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- Y
Donor	- Y
Business	- Y

CSO	- Y
Academia and research	- Y
Government	- Y

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) 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)



PROCESS 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislation are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes, with inputs from various stakeholders, and civil society in particular. It denotes the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis to inform and guide policy-making.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

*(Refer to the **progress marker explanatory note** for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)*

CSA (3)

Several policies have been developed with inputs from CSA network CIDP, FNSP IF, NNAP, School Meals Strategy etc.

Participation in the Budgeting process at county level and even at National level

Government (3)

The Government has been leading the review and spearheading inclusion of all stakeholders during various document development and review process.

The just concluded review of the NNAP was multi sectoral and brought on board various stakeholder, Review report is available
Within the different sectors there is the recognition of the role that Nutrition plays and both at county and National Level Nutritionist are getting integrated to the departments and sectors
The nutrition Unit is organized around various programs that have technical working groups that are Multi sectoral in composition. These working groups are constantly reviewing policies and strategies and engaged in development of new once where necessary EG to support implementation of the health act (work Place support), a guideline on how the workplace support as spelt out in the Health act has been developed by the MIYCN working group.

Business Network (3)

The private sector in Kenya is obliged by law to follow all the laws of the land. Because of this they are constantly reviewing and participating in updates on the existing and new policy guidelines and strategies. This is especially for those policies and strategies that affect the private sector

UN Network (3)

The UN supported the review of the current NNAP and is now supporting development of a new NNAP. Supported the development of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework. UN Network has continued engagement with the government to roll out the Food and Nutrition Security Policy.

Academia and Research Network (3)

The network has been engaged in generating evidence to inform policy and in generating this evidence a Multisectoral lens is always applied.

The network has been responsible for policy analysis through institutions like KIPPRA (Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis who are members of the network and in undertaking the analysis all stakeholders are consulted

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

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders work together and contribute, influence and advocate for the development of updated or new improved nutrition policy and legal frameworks for and their dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support, by encouraging parliamentarian engagement.

It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision-makers for legislation and evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.

FINAL SCORE 4

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (4)

Public participation has been something that the CSA has been engaging in, at Sub national level the action plans, guidelines

Budget analysis has been done and we have funding for both nutrition sensitive and nutrition specific

Food and nutrition act has been re-established in parliament and the FNSP IF has been completed and signed onto

Capacity development on advocacy have been supported by the CSA members

Government (4)

The Implementation of the National Nutrition action plan is supported by an Advocacy Communication and Social Mobilization strategy that continuously guides advocacy efforts to influence nutrition actions

During various actions and appeal stakeholders have come together to make joint appeals and joint narratives that effectively influence policy makers towards positive actions

Engagements with media has been life and the media have been brought on board to tell the nutrition story. Social media has also been a platform for advocacy to influence positive outcomes in Nutrition

Business network (3)

The network has also been engaged in advocacy actions like participating in joint forums that communicate positive outcomes for nutrition. The programs like workplace support in the tea estate has been impactful in the community level advocacy for good nutrition practices

UN Network (4)

Support provided to the MOH for the implementation Advocacy, Communications and Social Mobilization (ACSM) Strategy.

The UN network has been involved in review of various policies across sectors and development

Donor Network (3)

The network has through its members supported the sector efforts to ensure up to date nutrition evidence so as to fit into advocacy messages.

There have been development of joint statements or funding appeals by different stakeholders and the donor network has supported and responded to such appeals EG. Joint FLASH appeal during drought emergency

Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders – the government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners – coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of coherent policy and legislative frameworks.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

The CSA has been very active in advocacy to re-engage the new governance systems in place after the National elections.

At county level, there are various policies that were in process of development and engagements have been ongoing to ensure coherence

There was a lot of changes in governance that has slowed the process but CSA has been involved in actions to reeducate and re-engage the new political office holders

Government (3)

The process of reviewing the just ended NNAP took place and the process of developing a new action plan has begun

Development of policies and guidelines is always ongoing and is spearheaded by government and is very effective for the health sector and nutrition which works very well for the nutrition specific actions.

The review of the school meals policy is another example where the development of coherent updated coherent policies has been effective.

This progress marker could however do with a better and coordinated framework for how the review should take place especially for the CRF. The different sectors are performing well individually and other than Agriculture, Health and education which seem to be very integrated in the way they carry out their policies and guidelines review other sectors may need to be brought closer.

Business Network (3)

The network through its members have participated in policy review and policy development process. This is especially through the different associations and through representation by the networks secretariat

UN Network (3)

The network has contributed technically and financially to the review and development of various policies, guidelines and strategies. This has included provision of staff and/or consultants to support and contribute to the processes; supporting the convening of stakeholder's sessions to contribute to the documents; advocating for the development of the documents; provision of evidence or technical content; printing of documents; supporting the validation, dissemination and launches of documents; supporting the implementation of resulting documents among others.

Academia and Research Network (3)

The network members have participated as members in task forces tasked with developing or preparing write ups for various policy documents. Examples include the food and Nutrition security policy implementation framework

This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation, such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, maternity protection and paternity and parental leave laws, food fortification legislation, the right to food, among others.

FINAL SCORE 3 (mainly for operationalizing)

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (2)

CSA engage in designing programs that support various legal frameworks – BMS, support for breast feeding

Government (3)

While in the previous year some policies lacked the legal framework to operationalise the policies, this year a lot has been done in creating these frameworks for operationalizing various laws and policies EG. FNSP- IF, BMS ACT framework, Work Place Support Guidelines, re starting of the Food and Nutrition security Bill in Parliament

UN Network (3)

Support has been provided in facilitating enforcing various legislation e.g. the development of regulations for the BMS Act and standards for the Food Fortification laws. The enforcement of these laws is gradually being rolled out.

Development and roll out of various guidelines, policy statements and strategies across the nutrition programmes have been supported.

Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislative impact

This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislation have been reviewed and evaluated to document good practices, and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

CSA supported and participated NNAP review process which provided a good report for learning Write ups on good practices and knowledge sharing at the county level. Various write ups have been shared for knowledge management

Project outcome reports and dissemination ongoing and continuous while all this are done in a transparent and inclusive manner

Government (3)

The government network has been organizing various dissemination workshops and is on the forefront in ensuring inclusivity of as many stakeholders as possible to share findings and learning.

The nutrition website is running and is updating regularly. This serves to ensure continued platform for information sharing and learning

Nutrition bulletin is shared every quarter and has information from various stakeholders.

UN Network (3)

Financial and technical support provided to the functioning of many of the National and County Nutrition Technical Forums and knowledge sharing events.

Financial and technical support provided to the SMART surveys, KDHS's; MICS; enhancing the DHIS; researches that generate evidence on nutrition all of which help enhance the monitoring and evaluation of nutrition programmes.

Technical contributions and engagement to the establishment of the proposed National Information Platform for Nutrition.

Donor Network (3)

The network has been supporting the documentation of lessons learnt and has been participating in forums organized to share good practices and to provide platform for cross learning

Academia and research Network (2)

This network has been key in tracking and documenting learning for sharing. Evaluation of processes have been led by members of the academia and research network

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 2

*As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).*

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- Y
Donor	- Y
Business	- Y
CSO	- Y

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) 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)



PROCESS 3: Aligning actions around common results

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to improvements in nutrition demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together, and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that everyone, women and children in particular, benefit from improved nutrition. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into action. The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed upon across different sectors of government 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.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

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 among relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.

Please note: While progress marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislation, progress marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (4)

The CSA s are programming around the NNAPs, CIDP, CNAPs and other existing policies
Workplans created focusing on various guidelines in country and at county level, before writing programs gaps assessments are done to decide on areas of focus
The CSA is largely guided by the government for areas in which to program

Government (3)

There is presence of updated multi-sectoral nutrition situation analysis. This is especially done by the KFSSG twice a year and provides an good multi sectoral outlook of the nutrition situation in the country The stakeholder mapping is updated yearly and forms a guide for where partners are and where they should be directed with details of actions being done by the nutrition stakeholders. The Nutrition Inter Agency Committee (NICC) is very vibrant at this.

Further mapping for gender gaps and others could still be incorporated

The sector has undertaken capacity assessments across several counties and this is ongoing. With this the sector becomes aware on the capacity gaps and strengths existing for program implementation

UN Network (3)

The UN Network activities are harmonized under the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and under the SUN UN Network annual work plan. Regular meetings under the UNDAF and the Network are held to coordinate activities.

ALL UN network partners programmes are also fully aligned to the national policies and the planning period is also aligned to the government planning period

Previously the UN Network supported the development of the M&E Framework for Nutrition, this year is focused on supporting the implementation and roll-out.

Donor Network (3)

The networks work is guided by the sector priorities and using existing policies. The donor actions and programmes are all aligned to the government priorities.

Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition at the national and sub-national level

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium to long-term implementation of actions, with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should identify coordination mechanisms (and related capacity) and define the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.

FINAL SCORE 4

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (4)

The CSA has endeavoured to roll down to the counties all relevant policies. They CSA are also at the county level involved in development of CRF based on the existing policies and legal frameworks

CSA participate in the CRF writing process both at National and county level and this are costed with clear M&E framework

Government (4)

At a very broad level government planning is through the MTP 3 and Nutrition is mainstreamed and reflected. The governments leads and guides the MSP in formulating their annual workplan that aid implementation and achievement of objectives spelt out in the NNAP and in the FNISP IF.

The Implementation Framework is detailed with clear roles and responsibilities assigned to different sectors and stakeholders

The multisectoral plans are costed with clear Monitoring and evaluation frameworks

The county level is also being assisted to develop their clear and actionable implementation frameworks and action plan. For some counties this process is either completed, ongoing or yet to restart again based on timelines for the development of the new NNAP 2018 -2022

UN Network (3)

The members have supported the development of the FNISP IF which is geared to be the CRF Members are now supporting development of the NNAP 2 and involved in the development of annual work workplans across different sectors

Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework

This progress marker looks at the sequencing and implementation of priority actions at the national and sub-national level. This requires, on the one hand, a clear understanding of gaps in terms of delivery capacity and, on the other hand, a willingness from in-country and global stakeholders to mobilise technical expertise to timely respond to the identified needs, in a coordinated manner.

FINAL SCORE 4

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (4)

The CSA in deciding priorities is guided by the CRF and the gaps that exist. Most activities and programs run by CSA are all in support of the CRF or the NNAP objectives

Government (3)

The sector has spear led capacity assessment on Nutrition and this helps to channel and request for technical expertise in certain areas.

With the TAN assistance, the networks and the sector has received assistance in various areas that have been identified as gaps for programming around the multisector approach for nutrition

There exist documented and costed workplans for implementation with measurable targets both at National and County level. All this are towards achieving targets set out in the common results framework

At sub National and National level the annual workplans are prepared with inputs from all stakeholders Regular support supervision is undertaken to oversee and monitor implementation, there are training conducted like the coordination training that is done to the multi sectoral team to increase capacity for coordination

UN Network (3)

The network members align all their actions and programmes to priorities set out in NNAP and CRF.

Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per the Common Results Framework

This progress marker looks at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for good nutrition. It looks at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform and guide the refinement of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.

FINAL SCORE 2

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (2)

For nutrition sector the information and monitoring is very well captured and measured. On the larger look the other sector information monitoring is not strong for achievement of the CRF Indicators. NIPN will be a good platform where the CRF will clearly be monitored and this is in its inception. The NNAP 11 which is beginning will ensure good monitoring

Government (2)

The government has set out elaborate information systems to monitor performance. The DHIS is one such system for monitoring health indicators. While this is very good for health the other sectors are not very strong and in information systems.

Monitoring is done manually for those indicators that are not captured under DHIS. All sectors collect their information separately.

Progress reporting for a mix of indicators is done through the Kenya Households and budget survey

UN Network (3)

The network technically and financially supports the NITWG and the various data collection initiatives.

The network has been part of the discussions on the proposed multi-sectoral database for nutrition i.e. the National Information Platform for Nutrition and the KHO Kenya health Observatory

Donor Network (3)

The network member participates in joint monitoring for actions towards implementation of the set priorities. The network members have individually supported setting up of information systems to regularly collect data, analyse and agreed upon indicators e.g. the DHIS (District Health Information System)

Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact

This progress marker looks at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision-making and building the evidence base for improved nutrition.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

CSA has been involved in budget analysis and budget tracking. This happen every year and based on this we are it inform decisions

Surveillance is ongoing and this has informed actions (smart surveys, KABP surveys, End term evaluation, Mid term evaluation and NNAP review are examples

Government (3)

The government has led the population based surveys, reporting and dissemination of such surveys. This have been done regularly and results inform planning and progress

There has been sustained advocacy within government and among donors and implementers for effective coverage of Nutrition Specific and Nutrition sensitive programmes

Efforts to share lessons learnt have been sustained through various platforms (reports, Bulletins, Documentaries e.t.c.)

UN Network (3)

Evaluations and lessons learnt are undertaken though these tend to be at individual agencies level
The results of such evaluations are shared widely

Donor Network (3)

The network has invested and has supported dissemination of population based surveys like the Kenya National Micro Nutrient Survey findings. The donors have individually and as a network advocate for effective coverage of nutrition specific and nutrition sentive programmes

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 3

*As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).*

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- Y
Donor	- Y
Business	- Y
CSO	- Y

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) 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)



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) align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess the financial feasibility of the CRF

This progress marker looks at the extent to which the government and all other in-country stakeholders provide inputs for the costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways, including reviewing current spending or estimating unit costs).

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

In the last one year this has been strongly done at the Sub national level and FNSP IF are costed. Various costing models are employed in the county.

The various CSAs have a good understanding of their allocation to nutrition and the gaps that exist within their programs

Need for the CSA to consider sensitizing its members on the costing tool and the tracking tool

Government (3)

The government is fully aware of the costs of implementation of various activities both at National and at county level

Through government planning process for allocations are known for on budget finances and for various programs that are not captured on budget funding the government is still made aware during entry of partners for program inception meeting at both national and county level

Nutrition costing tool has been adopted for use in Kenya

UN Network (3)

The network has supported roll out the Nutrition financial tracking tool in counties.

The UN agencies undertake regular donor reporting in line with donor requirements. Further, they report to government on their respective funding support to the government on an annual basis.

The network has provided support in the development of costed nutrition action plans.

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition

This progress marker looks at the extent to which the government and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors and report on finance data, in a transparent manner, with other partners of the MSP, including the government.

FINAL SCORE 2

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (2)

The CSA has been instrumental in tracking and reporting financing for nutrition at National level and for a few counties. There still exist a gap in many counties and the tracking and reporting needs to be cascaded downwards

The CSA has spearheaded some budget analysis exercises and reports have been shared and used for advocacy and decision making.

Social audits have been supported and CSA has been on the ground training communities on social auditing and meaningful participation

Government (2)

While Financial tracking tool for Nutrition has been developed for the country, the concept of tracking nutrition finances is just being rolled out to the counties and at National level. The tool is yet to be fully utilized and is in process of being rolled at for use.

Various budget analysis works have been done in collaboration with different partners and this has informed decisions

Efforts within the Health sector and other sectors to make financial information public having been on going and there government has exercised openness on financial disclosure (Financial chalk boards at all health facilities and on notice boards of various departments)

UN Network (3)

There is a requirements to report against UNDAF and against Treasury each quarter all members report on actual expenditures

The UN has supported development of the nutrition costing tool and the nutrition financial tracking tool

Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls

This progress marker looks at whether the government and other in-country stakeholders identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds, through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, and setting-up of specific mechanisms.

FINAL SCORE 3

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

The Nutrition outcome is heavily funded by the CSA, a lot still needs to be done

The CSA as trained people to do budget advocacy which is bearing fruits

Government (3)

The government has offered leadership in the area of prioritizing and building consensus on identified gaps. The partners have however sometimes not been guided by the identified need as the resources invested are mostly scarce or not sufficient

Resource mobilization is always ongoing but the sector has never been sufficiently funded either by domestic or external funds

The mechanism for identifying funding gaps is there through the NNAP and The AWP the financing gap is clearly outlined

Assessment of additional funding need is ongoing especially around emergency and even for regular programs.

For the nutrition specific programs there is regular review and reassessing allocations and gaps

There is a gradual increase in counties funding nutrition with some counties are getting nutrition specific funding within budget lines in the program based budgets

UN Network (3)

The donor environment has seen a general reduction in funding available for nutrition. While the emergency response funding was been better, it has been delayed and largely inadequate to cover the needs. However prioritization and resource mobilization to cover gaps is ongoing

Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements

This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the scheduled fiscal year.

FINAL SCORE 2

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (3)

The CSA are keen to follow up on any pledges and they make sure to utilize the funds for the set priority

Government (2)

Dependent on Government response especially political class. Most funding from exchequer goes into recurrent expenditure e.g. staff.

Further advocacy should be on timely disbursement and not just financial allocation for nutrition.

UN Network (3)

For the UN all pledges are honored unless there is a circumstance hindering this. For any pledges from donors they are followed up to ensure honoring

Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact

This progress marker looks at how the government and in-country stakeholders collectively ensure predictable and long-term funding for better results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.

FINAL SCORE 2

(One score per progress marker)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

CSA (2)

The longest the CSA has received funds for has been 3 years. Most funding available is shortterm

The donor landscape in the country dictates the length of funds and with the country being declared middle income the funding opportunities for Kenya have decreased

For CSA the ability to attract funding is a good effort

Government (2)

The government is keen on following up on pledges and ensuring realization of external commitments Reporting for funds received either through external or domestic resources is done

At sub National level there is the issue of delayed disbursement of funds since devolution and efforts to address this are on going from National level.

UN Network (2)

All members are involved in leveraging and resource mobilization however duration of the funding is pegged on donor fund availability and financial arrangement.
 Efforts to ensure multi-year funding are underway and encouraged.

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 4

*As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).*

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- Y
Donor	- Y donor network is involved in that it is the main source of funding for activities undertaken
Business	- N/A
CSO	- Y

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvement/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in-country)

NEW OUTCOME MARKER: Review of progress in scaling up nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions over the past 12 months

In line with the SUN Movement MEAL system, this outcome marker looks at how processes put in place are effectively contributing to scaling up nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions. In compliance with principles of equity, equality and non-discrimination for all, participants are asked to reflect on their implementation progress, considering geographical reach and targeting of children, adolescent girls and women as well as delivery approaches that promote a convergence of interventions (e.g. same village, same household or same individual) or integration of nutrition interventions in sector programmes (e.g. nutrition education in farmer field schools or provision of fortified complementary foods for young children as part of food aid).

FINAL SCORE 4

(Scaling up nutrition-specific actions)

FINAL SCORE 3

(Scaling up nutrition-sensitive actions)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions

Examples include the promotion of infant and young child feeding, micronutrient supplementation, management of acute malnutrition, food fortification and nutrition education. For each example, please specify the geographical reach, targeted population and delivery approach. (Reference: 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition and the 2016 UN Compendium of Action for Nutrition)

Nutrition Specific interventions have been well implemented in the country with a lot of focus on scaling up High Impact Nutrition interventions. This has been done to scale in some counties specifically in the arid and Semi arid regions where nutrition vulnerability is high

Mass screening exercises and treatment of acute malnutrition has been scaled up

Campaigns to increase deworming rates among school going children twice a year

Efforts to scale up coverage with Vitamin A for children aged below Five years

Progress in scaling up nutrition-sensitive interventions

Choose clear examples from relevant sectors that you are including in your review. For each example, please specify the geographical reach, targeted population and delivery approach. (Reference: 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition and the 2016 UN Compendium of Action for Nutrition)

In the last one year the Nutrition sensitive programmes and actions are being given relevance.

In the Hunger safety net programme, the targeting has been nutrition sensitive which ensures that nutrition vulnerable households are deliberately included in the target

Agri- Nutrition actions have been on increase with programs promoting uptake and utilization of nutritious products

Partnering with the private sector in the tea estate to promote Maternal and Child Nutrition practices has been done in Kericho

Gender issues are picking up and in the programs implemented gender equity is taken care of and it has become a requirement in all funding proposals

Annex 1: Identified priorities

Please describe the status of the priorities identified in your most recent Joint-Assessment (for instance 2016-2017)

<p>Priorities identified in most recent JAA?</p> <p><i>Enter priority</i></p>	<p>Has this priority been met?</p> <p><i>Yes or No</i></p>	<p>What actions took place to ensure the priority could be met?</p> <p><i>Please outline stakeholders' contributions (government, UN, CSOs, donors, etc.)</i></p>	<p>Did you receive external technical assistance to meet this priority?</p> <p><i>If yes, please explain</i></p>
<p>1. Continue efforts towards establishment of nutrition MSPs at national and county levels</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>All networks have been involved in this activity as part of the members of the MSP. In establishing the networks at county level the Government, UN and CSA have been taking the lead during discussions and trainings</p>	
<p>2. Finalization of the FNSP Implementation Framework with subsequent roll-out in counties</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Mainly led by Government with support from UN and CSA Roll out to the County level is prioritized for 2018</p>	
<p>3. Advocate and support for the finalization and dissemination of key bills in parliament, e.g. Food and Nutrition Security Bill and the Breastfeeding Bill</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The protection of breastfeeding and workplace support bill is finalised and is now an act of Parliament. The food and Nutrition security Bill is now back in the parliament and is being discussed. Government is taking lead</p>	
<p>4. Reviewing progress of NNAP 2012-2017 to inform the new NNAP 2017-2022</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Consultant led the review but all stakeholders were involved. Consultants worked through the government</p>	<p>TAN</p>
<p>5. Development of strategies and guidelines geared towards enhancing nutrition sensitive programming including development of an Agriculture-Nutrition Strategy;</p>		<p>Agri-nutrition manual was finalised and launched this year. This was developed with participation of the MSP members</p>	

6. Roll out of the nutrition financial tracking tool at national and county level.	Y	The Government, CSA and UN Network have been spearheading the roll out of the Financial tracking tool at sub National level	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Support the dissemination and implementation of the Health Act of 2017 			
Please list key 2018-2019 priorities for the MSP			
<i>Consider what has been working well during the past year and what achievable targets can be identified and prioritised. Please also include network-specific priorities.</i>			
1.Support the Launch and roll out of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework			
2. Support the development of a new National Nutrition Action Plan 2018-2022			
3. Develop a guideline for key line ministries support to nutrition security with a multisectoral plan and budget for lobbying			
4. Conduct a high-level advocacy event for nutrition			
5. Identify nutrition champions and conduct a training/dissemination for the champions			
If you are seeking external support from the global Networks and/or external technical mechanisms, through the SUN Movement Secretariat, please provide relevant information			

Annex 2: Emergency preparedness and response planning

<p>1. Within the reporting period (i.e. the past year), has the country faced and responded to a humanitarian situation? If yes, what was the duration and type(s) of emergency (e.g. natural and climate-related disasters, communal violence, armed conflict etc.)?</p>	<p>Yes or No YES</p> <p>Please explain: The country was faced with a drought and responded Multi sectorally</p>
<p>2. Does the country have a national plan on emergency preparedness and response? If yes, does it include nutrition actions and indicators (both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive)?</p>	<p>Yes or No YES</p> <p>Please explain: Yes the contingency plan is Multisectoral and has been created taken into consideration both the Nutrition specific and sensitive indicators and actions</p>
<p>3. Is the MSP involved in discussions and planning for emergency preparedness and response? If yes, does the MSP engage with humanitarian partners, and how does the MSP contribute to linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Yes or No YES</p> <p>Please explain: response in Kenya involves many actors and in discussions the humanitarian partners are part of the discussions</p>
<p>4. What are the key limitations faced at the country level in terms of linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Please explain: funding constraints for development actions are the main constraints because humanitarian response is well funded</p>

Annex 3: Ensuring gender equality and that women and girls are at the centre of all SUN Movement action

<p>1. Does the MSP engage with a governmental Ministry or Department that is responsible for women's affairs/gender equality? If yes, what is the name of this Ministry/Department?</p> <p>If not a part of the MSP, how do you engage with this Ministry/Department?</p>	<p>Yes or No Not a member of the MSP</p> <p>Please explain:</p>
<p>2. Does the MSP engage with other non-state actors that are responsible for gender equality and the empowerment of women (such as UN Women or civil society organisations)?</p> <p>If yes, with whom do you engage?</p>	<p>Yes or No YES</p> <p>Please explain: Various CSAs that have a focus on women are part of the MSP eg WOFAK</p>

3.	How does the MSP ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as part of their work plan?	Please explain: Through mainstreaming gender into policy diocuments and into program documents
4.	What actions are identified and implemented by the MSP to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls at the community level?	Please explain: The CSA are the ones mainly engaged in gender mainstreaming and in documentation then gender mainstreaming is key
5.	Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?	Yes or No No
6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women’s empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes or No Yes, the constitution spells out gender equity and is explicit that representation of any ghender must not exceed two thirds Please explain:
7.	Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?	Yes or No No Please explain:

Annex 4: Advocacy and communication for nutrition

1.	Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition?	Yes or No Yes If yes, please provide specific examples of how you have engaged the media, which stakeholders were involved in supporting the engagement and what the results have been. Please share relevant material such as communications / media engagement plans, advocacy material shared with the media, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips etc. Examples: The media are invited to the nutrition events and are given briefings and press releases to guide messaging.
2.	Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP?	Yes or No Yes If yes, please provide specific examples of how parliamentarians have engaged, which stakeholders that supported their engagement

<p><i>Examples could include the existence of an active Parliamentary network or group focusing on food security and nutrition, votes in support of legal or budget changes that the MSP suggested, debates in parliament on nutrition or other concrete actions taken by parliamentarians in support of improved nutrition.</i></p>	<p>and what the results have been. Please share relevant material such as ToRs or action plans for Parliamentary networks or groups, budget tracking reports, reports from nutrition debates in parliament, speeches, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips etc.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
<p>3. Is there one or several nominated Nutrition Champions (including for example high-level political leaders, celebrities, journalists, religious leaders etc.) actively engaging to promote nutrition at national and/or local level?</p>	<p>Yes or No Yes</p> <p>If yes, please provide specific examples of who the champions are, how they have been engaging, which stakeholders that supported their engagement, and what the results have been. Please also share relevant material such as Nutrition Champion engagement plans, speeches, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips and other material etc.</p> <p>Examples: This include the first lady of the republic, various county level first ladies and governors identified as champions</p>
<p>4. Have you documented advocacy successes and best practice in reducing malnutrition through multi-sector and multi-stakeholder action, and shared them nationally and/or with regional and global partners?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>If yes, please provide specific examples of the successes and best practices you have documented, the stakeholders involved in documenting them, as well as how you have communicated them. Please share relevant material such as case studies or reports of advocacy successes and/or best practice etc.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
<p>5. Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?</p>	<p>Yes or No Yes</p> <p>If yes, please provide details about the objectives and expected outcomes of the event, key stakeholders you plan to involve as well as the estimated date and location.</p>

Details: Planning to have a nutrition week within the 3rd quarter of the year

Annex 5: Participants at the 2018 Joint-Assessment of the national multi-stakeholder platform

No.	Title (Ms./Mr.)	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN role (if applicable)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.		Magdalene Muoki	CISP	Member	Muoki@cisp_nairobi.org	0721590542	Y
2.		Janet Ntwiga	UNICEF-MOH	SUN Officer	jntwiga@unicef.org	0798474602	Y
3.		Job Ochieng	DSW	Member	Job.ochieng@dswkenya.org	0722383026	Y
4.		Valarie Wambani	KRCS	Member	Wambani.valarie@redcross.or.ke	0715019069	Y
5.		Florence Mwangi	We World	Member	Florence.mwangi@weworld.it	0734468773	Y
6.		Edwin Mbugua	Concern Worldwide	Member	Edwin.maina@concern.net	0722596028	Y
7.		George Ouma	DSW	SUN CSA Chair	George.ouma@dswkenya.org	0721316073	Y
8.		Dan Haswell	GAIN	SBN member	dhaswell@gainhealth.org	0716328350	Y
9.		Florence Mugo	MOH	Member	Flomugo88@gmail.com	070711425425	Y

10.		Gladys Mugambi	MOH	SUN Focal Point	gladysmugambi@yahoo.com	0720791041	
11.		Sicity Matu	UNICEF	Member	smatu@unicef.org	0704870756	
12.		Phillip Ndemwa	KEMRI	Member	Memberpndemwa@hotmail.com	0722871012	
13.		Titus Mungou	AMREF	Champion	Titus.Mungou@advocacyaccelerator.org	0722866830	
14.							