



A Knowledge Management and Learning System  
SUN Movement Phase 3.0



Transforming knowledge  
into action for nutrition  
& development

## Summary, Recommendations and Activities for Implementation

The SUN Movement 3.0 Strategy 2021-2025 re-emphasises the importance of country ownership and leadership in efforts to end all forms of malnutrition by 2030. It encourages countries to further prioritise and scale up actions for nutrition within their existing multi-sectoral national nutrition plans. It also encourages more empowered Government Focal Points and seeks to ensure all forms of malnutrition are addressed. Knowledge management and learning (KML) is given a greater emphasis in the SUN Movement's third phase in recognition of the need to ensure that the prioritisation, financing, scale up and tracking of actions are better informed by knowledge about what works best in different contexts

At the request of the SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS), between July and October 2020, N4D conducted a series of interviews with 92 stakeholders from country, regional and global levels and reviewed key literature in order to develop a proposed way forward for the SUN Movement KML system (see Terms of Reference in Annex 3). Preliminary findings were “pressure tested” with country, regional and global actors and their feedback fed into the proposed way forward.

In response to widespread calls for the SUN Movement to dramatically “up its game” in enabling countries to transform knowledge into action and nutrition impacts, the proposed KML system represents a major departure from ‘business as usual’ for KML in SUN 3.0. In line with the overall SUN 3.0 strategy to focus more on implementation and nutrition impact (in addition to strengthening the enabling environment), the KML system must focus more on facilitating the sharing of knowledge on what policies, legislations and practices work best to improve malnutrition. The KML system should emphasise the strengthening of national KML capabilities and ensure that the SUN Global Support System (GSS) maximises its collective potential. This requires a re-organisation of how it provides support to countries, involving a regionalised approach and prioritisation of peer to peer learning.

The uniqueness of the SUN Movement is its focus on multiple stakeholders coming together to scale up multi-sectoral nutrition approaches and actions. The success of the Movement requires the integration of nutrition into sectoral plans, increased domestic expenditure in order to realise a scaling up of these plans and implementation which achieves optimal coverage and convergence to address malnutrition. Countries require evidenced knowledge to prioritise and scale up multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder actions to maximise nutrition impact.

The Movement has gained considerable experience of multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral ways of working but recurring gaps in knowledge and learning potentially hinder further progress. Knowledge gaps vary with geo and socio-political contexts and stakeholders also have distinct knowledge needs. For example, frontline-service providers need to know how to optimise service delivery platforms for nutrition whilst SUN Business Network

members are interested in what legislative changes, relating to business practices, will have beneficial impact on nutrition.

There are knowledge gap areas which are common to many countries including how best to prioritise activities within their overarching national nutrition plans, how to fully integrate nutrition into sector plans, how to elicit and track domestic expenditure on nutrition, how best to assess the coverage of convergence of multi-sectoral programmes and how to better utilise and respond to geospatial data on levels of malnutrition.

The SUN 3.0 KML system must ultimately empower countries to fill knowledge gaps, build capabilities to prioritise, finance, implement, track, learn from and course correct nutrition actions, and thereby directly contribute to improved nutrition outcomes.

The proposed SUN 3.0 KML system is supported by **six principles**: (1) country owned and led; (2) driven by needs of decision makers and implementers; (3) sustainable; (4) subsidiarity; (5) coherence; (6) independence and rigour.

N4D proposes the following **definition**: Knowledge management and learning is a dynamic process for creating, curating, supporting and brokering knowledge to *strengthen capabilities for scaled up services and actions in order to reduce malnutrition in all its forms.*

Four **major operational shifts** in SUN's KML approach during phase 3 are suggested:

**1. SUN countries and the GSS increase emphasis on strengthening national KML systems** through the application of a five-step framework addressing: (i) KML governance and capabilities; (ii) categories of knowledge needs and in-country sources; (iii) knowledge needs of decision makers and implementers; (iv) overall strength of the KML system; and (v) how to address weaknesses in the system.

**2. SUN GSS focusses on sharing good practices on what works to reduce malnutrition, constraints and the brokering of more coherent and tailored support to countries** through a regionalised approach and more peer to peer learning.

**3. Clarity on the contributions of different parts of the SUN GSS**, building on comparative advantages. The proposed operational priorities should help the SMS and Networks clarify where their respective KML functions and activities begin and end. The key role of the SMS and Network Secretariats is to convene and facilitate joint KML processes, that provide coherent and tailored support to countries, harnessing the wealth of KML capacities which exist within and beyond SUN Networks.

**4. The establishment or strengthening of an existing Global Knowledge Hub, outside of the SUN architecture**, to help better signpost to countries where to access evidence on what works and guidance on the 'how' of implementation, as well as facilitate the filling of gaps in the evidence base.

Five main recommendations and the activities to strengthen the KML system over the first year of the SUN Road Map 3.0 are outlined below. Activities are not necessarily sequential. They may be concurrent.

#### **Recommendation 1:**

**Adopt the proposed principles, definition and operational objectives of KML for the SUN Movement third phase.**

#### **Activity 1:**

The SMS (with or without external support) pressure test the principles, definition and objectives as set out in this document (see Section 1) with Government Focal Points, country and global networks and once agreed, seek sign off from the Senior Leadership to

ensure Movement wide buy in and a ‘common KML language’ which is closely aligned with the wider Phase 3.0 strategy.

**Activity 2:**

To support the pressure testing produce a short-pre-recorded VLOG which talks to the relevant powerpoint presentation slides and/or via an online questionnaire (ideally ahead of the SUN Strategy finalisation) after which, there is a period of promotion via the SUN website and Newsletter.

**Recommendation 2:**

**Multi-stakeholder platforms, if they consider it to be useful, adapt the proposed national five step KML framework to review and strengthen national KML systems.**

The five step KML framework has been developed to help guide the Government Focal Point and other members of the national Multi Stakeholder Platform s/he coordinates in assessing and strengthening the KML system. It is not prescriptive and only intended as an aide should they wish to use it and seek support in its application.

**Activity 1:**

One member of the SUN GSS agrees to work with a communications specialist to develop an infographic of the 5-step framework for national KML system development for awareness raising purposes. This should be accompanied by a short VLOG which narrates the infographic for potential users.

**Activity 2:**

The SUN GSS coordinate dissemination and learning about the framework with country multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs) and encourage use of the framework to assess and strengthen national KML systems including, identification of whether dedicated KML capacity is needed.

**Activity 3:**

In-country actors support the application of the framework and consideration is given to who can best facilitate support to the MSP and any dedicated KML capacity.

**Activity 4:**

A set of indicators based on the framework are developed by the GSS and, after pressure testing with a number of pilot countries, are standardised and incorporated into the JAA process and MEAL reporting.

**Activity 5:**

The forthcoming review of Joint Annual Assessments (JAAs) explores how MSPs can strengthen on-going and fully inclusive reviews of progress, lesson learning, course correction and support needs.

**Recommendation 3:**

**The SUN GSS focusses on sharing good practices and lessons learnt & brokering support to enable countries to meet priority knowledge and learning needs through a regionalised approach and an increased emphasis on peer to peer learning.**

**Activity 1:**

The CLT immediately start convening regional working groups (RWGs) with the close involvement of the global Network Facilitators through a virtual meeting to advance the joint analysis of good practices and lessons learnt. This activity should not wait for the development of TORs but allow for ‘organic’ development.

**Activity 2:**

At the same time the CLT take the lead in discussions with existing regional entities such as the West and Central Africa Nutrition Working Group to develop the regionalised

approach by building on these types of more established platform and promoting collaboration between global and regional level actors.

**Activity 3:**

The SMS KML Specialist leads a process to define regional groupings, to determine whether they should be aligned with regional inter-governmental bodies, e.g. AUDA-NEPAD, ECOWAS, SAARC and SADC.

**Activity 4:**

The immediate task of the RWGs is to develop joint, concise country and regional analyses of good practices and lessons learnt based on existing sources of information (e.g. JAAs, SMS and network systems, the GNR country profiles, priority knowledge gaps already identified at the 2019 Global Gathering, from COVID Cycle One situation analyses etc).

**Activity 5:**

The country and regional analyses should inform intra-regional, cross-regional and country specific support to address country knowledge and learning needs drawing on a range of modalities (especially peer to peer learning, coaching & mentoring, as well as technical assistance).

**Recommendation 4:**

**SUN GSS agree specific contributions to the SUN KML system and reports to SUN countries and the SUN Leadership.**

**Activity 1:**

Building on the specific KML roles and responsibilities outlined in this document clarify individual KML roles and responsibilities of networks, SMS and TA providers and how they will contribute to the joint KML approach.

**Activity 2:**

To oversee regional and cross-regional support and to ensure accountability to countries and the Senior Leadership, the KML Specialist, with close engagement of the SMS Chief of Staff convenes a global SUN KML working group (consisting of RWG facilitators, KML focal points from global Networks, etc) to:

- develop and monitor a common SUN GSS KML work plan and consider resource needs and advocate for filling of resource gaps
- develop peer to peer learning approach (informed by, for example, R4D collaborative learning approach) to be used within and across regions;
- identify recurrent knowledge gaps across regions and to facilitate inter-regional learning processes, including planning of the next Global Gathering.

**Activity 3:**

The KML roles and responsibilities of SMS staff are clarified in job descriptions. Given the strategic importance of KML in SUN 3.0, there is a need for senior level leadership to ensure system wide buy in, coherence and strong accountability to countries and the Ex Com for the added value being provided. A KML specialist could provide valuable day-to-day support, in particular to enable information flow and management.

**Activity 4:**

At the end of year one, the SMS Chief of Staff should report to the Ex Com on progress in relation to the above, with the opportunity for GFPs to provide their feedback on the added value the SUN GSS is providing in supporting countries to address their critical knowledge gaps.

**Recommendation 5:**

**Advocate for the establishment or strengthening of an existing Global Knowledge Hub, outside of the SUN architecture, to better signpost knowledge and facilitate filling of critical knowledge gaps.**

**Activity 1:**

The SUN Ex Com discuss the need for the GKH and determine the best placed actor(s) from within and / or outside the SUN GSS to make progress on the functions, scope of work and resource implications.

## Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to everyone who gave their time to this assignment, for contributing their insights and experiences and for helping to shape the KML system for SUN 3.0. We thank the many SUN Government Focal Points, National Knowledge Management Teams, Network facilitators at country and global level, Regional agency representatives and SMS staff who were unfailingly generous with their time and idea. Thank you in particular to Debora Di Dio and Iselin Danbolt for guiding this assignment and for providing such hands-on support throughout.

During the course of this assignment, we benefited from the engagement of numerous individuals with whom we were able to pressure test the emerging thinking. We thank each and every one of them for their insights and time.

## Acronyms

Ex Com	SUN Executive Committee
GFP	Government Focal Point
GKH	Global Knowledge Hub
JAA	Joint Annual Assessment
KML	Knowledge Management and Learning
KML-SWG	Knowledge Management and Learning-Sub Working Group
MEAL	Monitoring Evaluation Accountability and Learning
MSP	Multi Stakeholder Platform
SBN	SUN Business Network
SCN	SUN Civil Society Network
SDN	SUN Donor Network
SMS	SUN Movement Secretariat
SUN GSS	SUN Movement Global Support System
UNN	UN Nutrition

# Contents

1. Background and Approach	9
2. KML principles, definitions and objectives	11
3. Strengthening national KML systems	14
4. KML Support for SUN Countries	19
5. Annex 1: List of people and groups consulted	32
6. Annex 2: Observations on past and present KML initiatives at the global & national levels	36
7. Annex 3: Terms of Reference to support the SUN Movement develop a KML strategy & operating model	39

## 1. Background and Approach

The SUN 3.0 strategy 2021-2025, re-emphasises the centrality of ownership and leadership at country level. It encourages countries to further prioritise and scale up actions for nutrition within their existing multi-sectoral national nutrition plans. It also encourages more empowered Government Focal Points and seeks to ensure all forms of malnutrition are addressed. Knowledge management and learning (KML) is given a greater emphasis in the SUN Movement's third phase in recognition of the need to ensure that the prioritisation, financing, scale up and tracking of actions are better informed by knowledge about what works best in different contexts.

The KML approaches thus far, have given rise to different activities (see Annex 2) which have generated knowledge and learning for different aspects of the Movement, but approaches have often been ad-hoc and, more globally driven than country led. The articulation of a core strategic objective for KML affords the opportunity to define an approach which can better serve the demands and needs of decision makers and implementers in their efforts to reduce malnutrition in all its forms.

Nutrition for Development (N4D) took up the assignment to develop a KML approach for SUN 3.0 and put 'meat on the bones' to enable the new strategic ambitions to be operationalised (see Annex 3 for the Terms of Reference). Our approach has been to consider the what, who and how of KML for SUN 3.0 and provide forward looking and practical suggestions. We have also developed a definition and set of principles for KML and broadly mapped existing KML provision within the SUN Movement, engaged as widely as possible in understanding country needs, capacities and processes and have scoped regional entities and, considered the roles SUN Global Support Structures (SUN GSS) and other global entities could play to strengthen KML.

Over a 4-month period (July to October), N4D conducted a series of interviews with 92 stakeholders from country, regional and global levels and reviewed key literature in order to develop a proposed way forward for the SUN Movement KML system (see Annex 1 for the list of those consulted). Preliminary findings were "pressure tested" with country, regional and global actors and their feedback shaped the proposed system.

In response to widespread calls for the SUN Movement to dramatically "up its game" in enabling countries transform knowledge into action and nutrition impacts, the proposed KML system represents a major departure from 'business as usual' for KML in SUN 3.0. In line with the overall SUN 3.0 strategy to focus more on implementation and nutrition impact (in addition to strengthening the enabling environment), the KML system must focus more on facilitating the sharing of knowledge on what policies, legislations and practices work best to improve malnutrition. The KML system should emphasise the strengthening of national KML capabilities and ensure that the SUN Global Support System (GSS) maximises its collective potential. This requires a re-organisation of how it provides support to countries, involving a regionalised approach and prioritisation of

peer to peer learning.

The uniqueness of the SUN Movement is its focus on multiple stakeholders coming together to scale up multi-sectoral nutrition approaches and actions. The success of the Movement requires the integration of nutrition into sectoral plans, increased domestic expenditure in order to realise a scaling up of these plans and implementation which achieves optimal coverage and convergence to address malnutrition. Countries require evidenced knowledge to prioritise and scale up multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder actions and maximise nutrition impact.

The Movement has gained considerable experience of multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral ways of working but recurring gaps in knowledge and learning hinder further progress. Knowledge gaps vary with geo and socio-political contexts and stakeholders also have distinct knowledge needs. For example, frontline-service providers need to know how to optimise service delivery platforms for nutrition whilst SUN Business Network members are interested in what legislative changes, relating to business practices, will have beneficial impact on nutrition.

There are gap areas which are common to many countries including how best to prioritise activities within their overarching national nutrition plans, how to fully integrate nutrition into sector plans, how to elicit and track domestic expenditure on nutrition, how best to assess the coverage of convergence of multi-sectoral programmes and how to better utilise and respond to geospatial data on levels of malnutrition.

The SUN 3.0 KML system must ultimately empower countries to fill knowledge gaps, build capabilities to prioritise, finance, implement, track, learn from and course correct nutrition actions, and thereby directly contribute to improved nutrition outcomes.

The document contains three further sections in addition to this one. Section 2 identifies principles and a definition to guide the design and functioning of the SUN KML system; its purpose and functions; consideration of whose knowledge and learning needs are most important; and propose KML operational objectives for SUN 3.0. Section 2 describes a five step KML framework for countries and Section 3 describes the KML support countries need. Each section includes the major operational shifts in the SUN KML approach during Phase 3, the rationale for these shifts and practical ways forward for operationalising the recommendations.

## 2. KML principles, definitions and objectives

➤ **Recommendation 1: Adopt the proposed principles, definition and operational objectives of KML for the SUN Movement third phase.**

### 2.1. Principles of KML and Definition for the Movement

The management of knowledge is now widely understood to be intrinsic to the success of the Movement's third phase. Done well, KML harnesses existing knowledge of what works, generates tacit and evidenced knowledge and actively supports country policies and actions. We propose seven principles to guide SUN 3.0 efforts at country, regional and global to strengthen KML as set out in [Box 1](#) below.

#### Box 1: Principles for SUN Movement KML

1. The KML system should be country owned and led.
2. Driven by decision-makers and sub-national implementers.
3. National KML systems should be built to sustain beyond the life of SUN Phase 3.0.
4. KML must embrace subsidiarity in that as much as possible, what is done is done locally either at the country or regional level.
5. The KML system should promote coherent support to countries by SUN supporters and ensure language is not a barrier to accessing knowledge and learning.
6. Managing knowledge requires independent and rigorous analysis and review to help generate evidence and guide stakeholders.

Knowledge Management and Learning includes information such as quantitative data from anthropometric surveys, health and food systems data, financial resource flows. Information can also be qualitative in the form of ideas that are communicated. While information, doesn't necessarily make us knowledgeable, it contributes to, and informs knowledge. Knowledge itself can be evidenced or tacit and Learning is what we take from doing for e.g. what works and what doesn't, and what we chose to share. In the context of the SUN Movement, information, knowledge and learning are all critically important. Equally important for the SUN Movement is the need to distinguish between different levels or types of knowledge. We distinguish three types.

1. Evidenced knowledge, e.g. identified geographic gaps in programme delivery based on coverage and spatial mapping
2. Experiential knowledge. This can be explicit or tacit (i.e. it is in people's heads) and in the latter case, it is best accessed through discussion such as through peer to peer exchanges
3. Knowledge gaps. This is where there is insufficient information, experience and learning to inform normative or other guidance and technical assistance provision.

Taking the above into account and recognising that KML is critical to drive prioritisation and action at country level, we propose the definition for SUN 3.0 presented in [Box 2](#).

### Box 2: A definition of KML for SUN 3.0

Knowledge management and learning is a dynamic process for creating, curating, supporting and brokering knowledge to strengthen capabilities for scaled up services and actions in order to reduce malnutrition in all its forms.

## 2.2 Purpose of a knowledge management and learning system for nutrition

The purpose of a KML system, therefore, is not only to create, organise and share knowledge but to build capabilities required for scaling up effective nutrition actions that deliver sustainable nutrition outcomes, i.e. reduce all forms of malnutrition.

For users to have capabilities, they require knowledge, skills, resources and authority to act. The KML system involves providing users with the knowledge and skills they require. Other parts of the global support system need to support countries to strengthen political authority and finances through advocacy and financial assistance.

There are four main functions of a KML system which need to be performed both in countries and by the global support system for nutrition: (1) knowledge creation; (2) knowledge curation; (3) learning support; (4) brokering support. These four functions are explained in [Box 3](#) below.

### Box 3: Functions of a KML system

**Creation:** is the generation of new knowledge (explicit/evidenced and tacit) about levels of malnutrition, causes, progress in relation to targets, best practices, enabling and hindering factors etc. through scientific research, nutrition surveillance systems and operational learning (e.g. programme evaluations).

**Curation** entails collating, vetting, organising and making knowledge available, e.g. through online portals, resource centres etc. It involves the signposting of knowledge to decision makers and implementers.

**Support:** is the direct provision of assistance (including TA) to help meet knowledge and learning needs. It helps people turn knowledge into improved capabilities, action and outcomes. It includes, for example, the provision of policy and operational guidance, technical assistance, facilitating peer to peer learning exchanges, mentoring and coaching.

**Brokering:** is the matching of knowledge and learning needs of decision makers and implementers with providers of knowledge and learning support. It is sometimes described as the missing link in the evidence to action chain. It involves the identification of needs, the mapping of potential support providers and the identification of how needs can be best met.

There is a need to consider who is best placed to perform these functions at different levels, sub-nationally, nationally, regional and globally.

## 2.3 Whose KML needs count?

In SUN 3.0, the KML system must:

- Prioritise the knowledge and learning needs of national and sub-national decision makers and implementers to increase their capabilities to prioritise and implement effective actions and improve nutrition outcomes.
- Strengthen nationally owned and led KML capacities and systems in order to meet these needs.

There are four main reasons for this national and sub-national emphasis. First, KML needs of national and sub-national actors can only be clearly articulated at country level as

these will be highly context specific. Second, the outputs of national KML systems are far more likely to influence decision-making at country level, than KML outputs generated at global level. Third, KML systems must be sustainable and endure beyond the life of the SUN Movement. Last, most countries have an abundance of information and knowledge generated by multiple actors over many years about nutrition programming, surveys, evaluations, etc, most of which is not curated or held in one repository making it very difficult for national decision-makers to utilise the full body of knowledge available in a country.

It is important to recall, that the original vision for the Movement was that the SUN Global Support System (GSS) would be phased out by 2020, and that the SUN Movement is predicated on the understanding that while international resources will be front-loaded in scaling up efforts, domestic expenditure will need to replace this over time. It is therefore, important to work towards strengthening sustainable and locally financed national KML systems.

#### **2.4 SUN 3.0 KML operational objectives**

We propose two operational objectives for SUN 3.0:

1. Strengthen national KML (and sub-national) systems and ensuring that knowledge and learning inform decisions and actions and contribute to improved nutrition outcomes
2. Increase the availability of, and access to, knowledge and learning support to address needs which cannot be met within countries.

In the following sections we identify the actions, systems and approaches required in SUN countries and in the SUN GSS and wider ecosystem to achieve these objectives.

### 3. Strengthening national KML systems



**Recommendation 2: Multi-stakeholder platforms, if they consider it useful, adapt the proposed national five step KML framework to review and strengthen national KML systems.**

This section contains a five step KML framework by which countries can review, operationalise and strengthen their KML systems should they chose to do so. The framework is not prescriptive but, rather, has been developed to help guide the Government Focal Point and other members of the national Multi Stakeholder Platform in assessing and strengthening the KML system. A country can decide which step best meets their needs and should the GFP and the MSP members wish to use it, seek support in its application where this is needed.

The five step KML framework has been informed by the review of existing national and global KML systems and initiatives (see Annex 2) and in response to country level consultations during which, a clearer and logical way of understanding KML and in its component parts was requested. This framework is not intended to be exhaustive but rather, is indicative of a more deliberate focus on KML in order to systematise KML nationally. It does not replace existing KML efforts nor does it suggest there is a one size fits all blueprint. It is a potential framework around which countries can coalesce around their KML needs as they articulate country action plan priorities and embed KML into the process of setting priorities, tracking progress and learning by doing. Countries know best what their needs are and should always be in the driving seat of articulating and seeking support to meet their needs. Fostering stronger national KML systems is no different in this regard.

Decision makers and implementers have a range of knowledge and learning needs relating to their different roles in reducing malnutrition. Learning needs are the gaps between the learner's current level of knowledge and skills, and the level of knowledge and skills required to identify and implement actions that effectively contribute to reductions in malnutrition.

In considering the national and sub-national level, the framework below provides the overarching considerations around national KML capabilities and potential governance changes to improve capabilities. This would be a starting point for the assessment of country specific KML needs. It then goes on to consider the KML needs of different stakeholders and finally, the way in which countries can assess and strengthen their KML system.

#### **Step One: Identify in-country KML capability and potential strengthening of KML governance**

Countries may need to create a dedicated KML capacity within the most appropriate national structure. Recognising that there is no 'blueprint' approach, and also recognising

<sup>1</sup> As outlined in Annex 2, there is an enormous spectrum of nutrition KML capability within countries. At one end are countries who rely on five yearly DHS/MICS surveys and MoH reporting on nutrition programme delivery. At the other end of the spectrum are countries like Pakistan, Myanmar and Tanzania that have dedicated national KML units and portals with considerable analytical capability.

resource constraints, possible options are to utilise an existing platform<sup>1</sup>, consider an enhanced role for an M&E specialist as part of the MSP, establish a KML sub-working group as part of the MSP, or, resources permitting, secure dedicated KML capacity to work alongside the Government Focal Point (GFP).

Whether any or a combination of these options are appropriate for a country will depend on a variety of factors such as the functionality of the MSP, the existence and capacity of the M&E individual for the MSP and availability of government or national partners resources to fund a dedicated KML person. It is worth noting, that in most countries where the IASC Nutrition Cluster approach is activated, the national nutrition cluster coordinator is supported by a dedicated Information Manager whose role is deemed to be critical to inform assessment, planning and response. Given the comparative complexity of nutrition in non-crisis contexts, it appears self-evident that the need for a dedicated KML role within government for nutrition should not be an optional extra. Enabling this capacity will require advocacy and political prioritisation as well as the in country and global support system to consider the resource implications. The SUN strategic objective for KML cannot be expected to be achieved without adequate resourcing.

Our consultations show a preference for addressing national KML needs through, the formation of a KML sub-working group (KML-SWG) of the MSP (reporting to the GFP and MSP). The purpose of the KML-SWG (or equivalent national capability) would be to adopt, and where necessary, adapt this framework and implement steps 2-5 described below.

### Step Two: Assess knowledge categories, needs, sources and recurring gaps

The KML-SWG (or the equivalent forum a country has chosen) would need to consider the main knowledge categories relevant to scaling up nutrition, identify country specific recurring knowledge needs and the sources of information that exist to meet these needs. These are set out below in [Table 1](#).

**Table 1: Knowledge categories, needs & sources**

Six main knowledge categories	Recurring knowledge needs	Main knowledge sources
<b>1.Strengthen enabling environment (governance)</b>	The case for investing in nutrition. How to ensure high level political leadership? How to ensure functional MSPs? How to manage conflicts of interest? How to develop a Common Results Framework?	Research/evidence base and cross-country learning
<b>2.Situation analysis (planning &amp; monitoring)</b>	What are the trends in rates of malnutrition; What are the causes & risk factors; (disaggregated by geographic area; gender; age... etc) How best to strengthen national information systems to guide decision making and action?	Nutrition information systems (surveillance, needs assessments), e.g. NIPN
<b>3.Response analysis and programme effectiveness (planning)</b>	Which interventions are needed in different sectors and what is the evidence for works best? What technical capacities are needed? How to prioritise interventions and integrate into sectoral plans?	Research (national, regional & global) and evaluation systems (internal & independent)
<b>4.Resource mobilisation (financing)</b>	How much do interventions cost? How to integrate into sectoral budgets? How to mobilise domestic and international finance? What are the trends in domestic budgets and the gap between allocation and spend? How to track financial flows?	Research (national, regional & global) and evaluation systems (internal & independent)

Six main knowledge categories	Recurring knowledge needs	Main knowledge sources
<b>5. Service delivery (implementation)</b>	How to implement interventions, including targeting? Who is doing what, where? How is coverage and convergence of interventions being assessed?	Training for frontline service providers
<b>6. Monitoring &amp; evaluation (learning, accountability, planning)</b>	Who is doing what where? Who is financing what? What is the coverage & convergence? What is the quality of implementation? What are the outcomes and impacts of policies and actions? What are strengths & weaknesses (determinants of success)?	Multi-stakeholder reviews (e.g. Joint Annual Assessments)  Programme monitoring & financial tracking systems, e.g. REACH mapping  Research and evaluation systems

### Step Three: Identify and categorise the main knowledge user needs

National and sub-national stakeholders have different KML needs depending on whether they are service providers, decision makers, advocates or other members of the in-country system. These KML needs (see [Table 2](#) below), once identified, can be prioritised to inform country support, SUN GSS and other actors in the wider global KML ecosystem that can support the KML needs.

Stakeholder Type	Knowledge gaps
<b>Frontline service providers</b>	How to coordinate and modify delivery platforms to enable multi-sector programme delivery. How to modify sector programmes to increase nutrition sensitivity. How to navigate competing demands for scarce resources and ensure nutrition resources are earmarked and protected.
<b>Sub-national decision makers</b>	How to integrate nutrition into devolved sectoral plans. How to make the case for financing for nutrition as part of these plans. How to budget monitor nutrition spend
<b>Gov Focal Points</b>	How to make a country specific case for increased domestic spend on nutrition? How to make sectors accountable for nutrition targets? How to show impact of multi-sector nutrition programmes and related spend? How to prioritise interventions and make decisions about geographical or population specific targeting? How to maximise international financing for nutrition? How to stay up to date on the latest and most vital evidence, guidance and tools?
<b>Sectoral leads on nutrition</b>	Why invest in nutrition? What nutrition sensitive interventions are achievable and proven in country? What costs will this add to the existing budgets? What gains will be made?
<b>Donors</b>	What are the trends in government domestic spend on nutrition? What level of programme coverage, quality and impact is being achieved?
<b>UN</b>	How well are we supporting the monitoring of programme targeting, coverage and convergence? Is the country being adequately supported to capture evidence of impact?
<b>CSOs</b>	To what extent is government delivering on its financial and legal commitments? What are main advocacy opportunities for further embedding nutrition within systems at sub national and national levels? What additional accountability and advocacy opportunities are critical to the prioritised plans and how can community realities be represented
<b>Business</b>	What levels of Government policy and legislative influence can bring about food systems change? What proportion of the population can be reached through SMEs to influence nutrition? Which SMEs should be prioritised for growth?
<b>Academia</b>	How can programme delivery, design and impact best be measured? What new innovations are needed to tackle malnutrition? How well is the country institutional architecture for nutrition functioning?

#### Step Four. Review needs and status of the KML system

This fourth step is to take a more holistic view of the national KML system by examining questions about comprehensiveness and efficiency of the system, processes for identifying knowledge needs and whether knowledge is being used by non-specialist decision-makers. We recommend that progress with a KML system is included in the JAAs and that the types of descriptive indicators outlined in Table 3 can be scored to facilitate this assessment.

Table 3: Descriptive indicators for assessing country KML system

<b>Comprehensiveness and efficiency</b>	Does the system contain a good balance of information, knowledge and learning? Does the system minimise duplication of information and knowledge collection and curation and is it adaptive to changing needs, e.g. Covid or other threats? Does the system capture all/most knowledge generated in country?
<b>Identification of knowledge needs</b>	To what extent do national and subnational MSPs / decision makers define KM questions and needs and identify their in-country support needs? Are KM efforts in country orientated to answering country specific questions and are these questions agreed at the MSP meetings? Are critical country knowledge gaps being addressed (see Table on Knowledge gaps)?
<b>Decision making</b>	What evidence is there that knowledge is being used for decision making, does the KM system follow up on use of knowledge for decision-making and what is the process for ensuring that knowledge is used to influence decision-making?
<b>Dissemination</b>	Is knowledge being curated and disseminated in a form that allows non-nutrition specialists make decisions that will positively impact malnutrition?

#### Step Five: Ensuring effective mechanisms to meet knowledge and learning needs

The process for this final stage involves at **least four** distinct areas of focus and enquiry in order to improve the national KML system overall.

##### **Are the knowledge and learning needs of sub-national actors being prioritised?**

Our consultations revealed strong calls for a much greater emphasis on ensuring that frontline service providers (including businesses, food producers etc) and government officials (sectoral nutrition focal points etc) have access to the knowledge and learning they require to be able to perform their roles effectively. MSPs (or KML sub working groups/ focal points) should identify the priority knowledge gaps and learning needs of these actors (step 3), develop a plan for meeting these needs and build sub national implementation capacities. Where necessary, an increased prioritisation of domestic and international financial investments should be delivered to sub national level to support this.

##### **Are independent national actors engaged in research and evaluation of what works and what needs improving?**

Government led KML systems are critically important. However, local and national governments should also encourage independent actors to undertake rigorous in-country research and evaluation of interventions, policies, ways of working, etc, with a view to identifying what works and where there are limitations.

##### **Are MSPs being supported to review progress and lessons learnt?**

Consultations suggest that there is a need to move from JAA's to on-going processes by which MSPs review progress in relation to National Nutrition Plans, identify achievements and good practices, challenges and lessons learnt, knowledge and learning needs and support requirements. The primary purpose of these processes should be in country course correction, building on successes and addressing constraints. We suggest that this should be one of the aims of the review and revision of JAAs which is being planned by the SUN GSS.

Government focal points and the KML SWG (or equivalent) need to play the lead role in facilitating these reviews and learning processes and ensure that they inform future plans and actions. A culture of trust and transparency within the MSPs will be important to encourage honest recognition of weaknesses as well as strengths and achievements.

**Are countries being enabled to exchange knowledge and learning?**

During SUN 3.0, SUN countries will need to be supported to proactively share their knowledge and learning between countries, the SUN GSS and wider ecosystem. They may need to seek support from other countries and international actors where in-country resources are constrained for this type of learning provision.

## 4. KML Support for SUN Countries

During SUN 3.0, countries will need support to strengthen their KML capabilities in order to meet their knowledge and learning needs, access information and knowledge which is not available in-country and share evidenced information, knowledge and learning with other countries and actors.

The global support ecosystem for nutrition in which the Movement resides, encompasses a large and diverse range of global and regional actors, institutions and initiatives which all have a role in supporting country needs. An illustration of these is provided in Box 4. and more detail information on past and present KML initiatives is provided in Annex 2. A more detailed mapping of global and regional KML related entities has been developed and is available on request from the SMS.

### Box 4: Examples of actors in the global support ecosystem.

Regional inter-governmental bodies and structures:

e.g. African Union Development Agency (AUDA) – NEPAD, African Development Bank, Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) West Africa Health Organisation (WAHO) Nutrition Forum, Central America Sistema de la Integración (SICA), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) West Africa Health Organisation (WAHO) Nutrition Forum, Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)

Research institutes, consortia such as IFPRI Exemplar studies, DATAdent, Food Systems Dashboard

UN regional offices, WFP Centres of Excellence (China, Brazil and Cote D'Ivoire)

UN inter-governmental bodies

e.g. World Health Assembly and the Committee on World Food Security

SUN Movement Secretariat, Executive Committee and Lead Group and SUN Networks

Technical Assistance to Strengthen Capabilities (TASC), Capacities for Nutrition (C4N), including NIPN, IASC Global Nutrition Cluster – Technical Alliance

Global Nutrition Report and allied Country and Regional Profiles

A key added value of SUN GSS within this global support ecosystem is:

To bring countries & other actors together in order to share good practices and broker coherent and tailored support in response to country knowledge and learning needs (that cannot be met in-country).

SUN structures should facilitate not substitute or duplicate what governments, networks and their members or other actors are or should be doing.

Examples of valued KML support to countries by SUN and non-SUN actors are referenced in Annex 2. From a KML perspective, we identify a number of limitations in the global support ecosystem which constrain effective support to countries as summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Areas for improvement in the KML system

KML functions	KML areas of improvement
Provision and Brokering of support to countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need for more tailored &amp; coherent support to countries</li> <li>▪ Inadequate emphasis on peer to peer learning</li> <li>▪ Support to countries is fragmented &amp; capacities of SUN network members &amp; regional actors not being adequately leveraged</li> <li>▪ No joint mechanisms to identify country specific needs and broker coordinated &amp; tailored support</li> </ul>
Knowledge Creation & Curation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inadequate signposting for where to find evidence and guidance</li> <li>▪ Tracking of country progress and factors determining success is split across the GNR, SUN, Exemplars etc</li> <li>▪ There are critical knowledge gaps</li> </ul>



**Recommendation 3: The SUN GSS focusses on sharing good practices and lessons learnt & brokering support to enable countries to meet priority knowledge and learning needs through a regionalised approach and an increased emphasis on peer to peer learning.**

#### 4.1 Re-orientating the SUN GSS to better meet country needs

It is clear that, during phase 3.0, the SUN GSS must build on past successes and increase its contribution to increased capabilities in SUN countries to scale up effective actions for improved nutrition. The SUN KML system must aim to help country stakeholders meet their knowledge and learning needs by (1) supporting the strengthening of national KML systems; and (2) helping country stakeholders access knowledge and learning support that cannot be provided by in country actors, especially from peers and countries facing similar challenges.

In order to achieve these KML objectives, the SUN GSS must work more closely together in order to match country specific support with country specific needs. This observation has been repeatedly made as far back as the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) in 2015, the Mid Term Review in 2018 and most recently in the 2020 Strategic Review.

The SUN Movement has highly valuable Networks, containing most if not all the key actors involved in providing support to countries, with strong linkages to country level counterparts and considerable resources to support country capabilities and action.

However, as identified in the past, the capacities and resources of SUN network members, are not being adequately and coherently harnessed to respond to country needs.

Our consultations, according with previous reviews, suggest that there is a pressing need for greater coherence through joint mechanisms which bring together actors, from within and beyond the SUN GSS, in order to jointly:

- Collate good practices and knowledge and learning needs
- Broker tailored and coherent support in response to country knowledge and learning needs, including support to help strengthen national KML systems, with a strong focus on cross-country and peer to peer learning.

We propose that existing platforms are strengthened or Regional Working Groups (RWGs) are established to perform these functions. Many stakeholders, including GFPs have advocated for a regionalised approach during the consultations on the SUN 3.0 strategy, as well as during this KML assessment. A regionalised approach would help to better tailor support to country specific needs. It provides a pragmatic way of organising the SUN GSS to ensure it is more country focussed and responsive. There would need to be agreement on the definition of regions, for example following existing inter-governmental or UN country groupings.

It is important to be clear what the proposed RWGs **are not**:

They would **not be new structures**, requiring staffing, but rather a new way of working that brings actors together to better coordinate more tailored support in response to country knowledge and learning priorities. The RWGs should not require substantially increased resources for the SMS but rather enable better coordinated and efficient use of existing capacities sitting within and beyond SUN networks at global and regional levels.

The RWGs would **not be (sub)regional level** groups but rather regionally oriented spaces which bring together both regional and global actors to align their support with country needs. Participation should not require agency representation / presence at (sub)regional.

RWGs **should not place increased reporting and other work burdens on countries** but provide the means by which global and regional actors work more coherently together to support countries.

It is also important to be clear what the RWGs are:

The added value of the RWGs to countries should be **more coherent and tailored KML support aligned with country defined needs and priorities**.

An added dimension of this need for more coherent and tailored support is that the SUN Movement is made up of 62 countries and 4 Indian states, each of which has unique cultural norms and languages which need to inform the scope of KML support and build on existing knowledge and experience from the different regions. Language is often cited as a barrier to knowledge uptake particularly in the French and Spanish regions where Anglocentric knowledge products and resources are often not useful.

The regionalised approach as proposed should help in overcoming these barriers by ensuring countries are enabled to share and benefit from the exchange of knowledge and learning in the dominant language/s they use and in the way they like to interact for example via more visual or verbal/discussion mediums or via the written word. Where vital global normative or generic nutrition knowledge is generated, this must always be translated into the main languages of the regions as is currently practiced by many of the UN agencies both globally and regionally. Where this is not the case, the GSS needs to advocate for equity in language access. The composition of the SMS CLT ensure multi-lingual capabilities and staff are organised around regional languages which enables a good day to day level of interaction with the GFPs.

It is vital that SUN and other networks continue to strengthen their own KML support to countries, including through their own internal regionalised approaches as they see fit. The RWGs should only do what is not already being done by national, regional and global level actors and their Networks. Knowledge and learning gathered by global Networks through their own systems should inform joint analysis and more coherent country support. The RWGs provide the opportunity for the SMS and Networks to come together and increasingly align their support with a common understanding of country priorities and needs.

The SUN GSS should support and strengthen existing (sub) regional, multi-stakeholder mechanisms and capacities where they exist. At least one region, West and Central Africa,

has a regional, multi-stakeholder nutrition working group and a joint action plan for delivering country support including KML. This type of arrangement provides an opportunity to bring regional and global actors together to coordinate their KML support to countries in the region. Nutrition capacity within (sub)regional inter-governmental bodies varies from region to region. Where inter-governmental nutrition capacities do exist, it is vital that they are included and supported to play leading roles. Hence, there should be no standard model applicable to all (sub)regions. The facilitation, composition and ways of working of the RWGs would vary according to the existing capacities and circumstances of different regions.

### **A regionalised approach in practice**

The following suggestions for the practical functioning of RWGs could provide the basis for the future articulation of terms of reference:

#### *Functions*

There are two core functions envisaged. The first is to collate good practices and country knowledge and learning needs utilising existing sources of information. The second is to broker tailored and coherent support to countries by identifying the best placed actors and modalities for meeting shared and country specific support needs and brokering the required support, especially through peer to peer learning initiatives (see Section below).

#### *Facilitation*

Where regional mechanisms already exist, they might be jointly convened and facilitated by regional focal points (e.g. from inter-governmental bodies and the UN) and the SMS CLT. Where there is no existing regional capacity, the SMS CLT could play a stronger convening and coordination role. It will be essential that facilitators are focussed on helping broker the best possible support to meet the needs of all countries and not limited in doing so by institutional interests or allegiances. It will also be important for facilitators to recognise the continued independence of Networks and organisations participating in the working groups whilst at the same time facilitating greater alignment of country support efforts around shared country priorities.

#### *Composition*

The RWGs should be open to any regional and global actors who can contribute to their functions as described above, including nutrition focal points from regional inter-governmental bodies, staff from SUN global network secretariats, members of SUN networks and TA mechanisms such as TASC<sup>2</sup> and the GNC-TA<sup>3</sup>. The RWGs should enable the bringing together of individuals with a strong knowledge of countries in each region (or sub-region) from across the SUN GSS as well as from the wider global support ecosystem, including regional level actors, e.g. inter-governmental, UN etc. It is recognised that different Networks and their members will be able to engage in RWGs to differing extents according to their capacities.

#### *Collating good practices and support needs*

Existing sources of information, including country and network KML systems (e.g. JAAs), should be utilised to collate good practices and support needs of individual countries. It will be important to build on and strengthen existing processes and avoid duplication. In the short term, RWGs could start with the recurrent needs and priorities expressed by the countries during the 2019 Global Gathering, COVID cycle 1, and SUN 3.0 strategy.

---

<sup>2</sup> TASC is the successor to the DFID MQSUN+ initiative and stands for Technical Assistance for Strengthened Capabilities.

<sup>3</sup> GNC-TA is the new iteration of the Global Technical Alliance is the new iteration of the Global Technical Assistance Mechanism for Nutrition.

As discussed in Section 2, in the longer term, good practices and support needs should be identified through strengthened country owned KML systems and on-going reviews of progress by MSPs. It should not involve additional reporting. The SUN global Networks should continue to collate country information and analysis from their national counterparts to inform the collective country analysis.

The incentives for national MSPs to share their good practices and support needs are the commitments of SUN countries to do likewise and of regional and global actors to jointly analyse country support priorities and align their support accordingly. There should be no obligation on countries to do this. A more country focussed, coherent and responsive SUN GSS should provide the confidence to countries to proactively share learning and demand support.

For each country in a (sub)region, a 2-page summary of good practices, critical constraints and support needs could be produced by the RWG facilitators and updated as required. Given the importance of strengthening national KML systems during SUN 3.0, country analyses should include an assessment of progress in this regard. The country summaries should be reviewed, discussed and agreed during RWG meetings. These short country analyses should provide all stakeholders, including SUN Ex Com, Coordinator, SMS, Networks, TA providers, regional actors etc with a common understanding of country good practices and support needs with links to more detailed information (e.g. GNR country profiles, national KML portals, JAAs etc).

They should then provide the basis for brokering coordinated support, the actions to be taken by different stakeholders and improved accountability to countries. Whereas country profiles in the SUN Annual Reports provide information on the achievements of countries, these country analyses should focus on good practices (i.e. what actions/ approaches contributed to the achievements) and on critical constraints, for which knowledge and learning support is required. These country analyses should directly inform the sharing of learning between countries and the brokering of support. In short, they should lead to decisions, action and accountability for support provided to countries.

The evolving SMS-CLT 'Good Practice and Lessons Learnt Database' and the SUN LABS tool developed by the SUN CSN could be explored as a potential basis for these collective country analyses.

Collective understanding of country specific good practices and priority support needs should lead to the identification of common needs (themes) and cross fertilisation of knowledge and learning between countries within regions as well as between regions (see below).

Examples of good practice and lessons learnt should be fed into the proposed Global Knowledge Hub (see below) once that is functional. Within the proposed process, there should be a loose definition of what is meant by good practice, e.g. practices which MSPs have collectively identified as making a valuable contribution to improved nutrition actions and outcomes. To build the evidence base for nutrition actions and practices, there is also a need for more rigorous research and evaluation. This requires independent analysis by national and global actors, with the Global Knowledge Hub providing signposting to evidence based good practices.

#### *Brokering support to countries*

There should be regular meetings for analysing country information, tracking support needs, reviewing on-going support and identifying how additional support is best provided to meet needs. Once priority support needs have been identified, the best modalities for meeting needs and support providers or facilitators should be identified. As recommended elsewhere in this document, a strong emphasis should be placed on facilitating the sharing of experiences and learning between countries, through peer to peer exchanges (e.g. coaching & mentoring, exchange visits, regional gatherings etc), to complement other

forms of technical assistance. The RWGs should have a ‘map’ of potential support providers and facilitators that can be called upon. This map should include a wide range of knowledge and learning providers / facilitators from across the global support ecosystem, including country actors who can support peer to peer learning. Countries should have the opportunity to select from a range of possible support providers and encouraged to provide feedback on the support they receive.

### *Peer-to-peer learning*

A primary function of the SUN GSS would be to facilitate cross country and peer to peer learning in order to help specific country stakeholders to share their experiences and learn from each other about what works and how to overcome challenges they face. This type of support would build on the efforts already undertaken in SUN 2.0 (see Annex 2) and complement the TA provided by external service providers such as MQSUN+, UN agencies and others. There have been a number of initiatives within the SUN Movement seeking to promote inter-country exchanges, including learning exchanges organised by the SMS, learning exchanges between national CSAs organised by the CSN and, of course, Global Gatherings. Results for Development (R4D) have more recently submitted a proposal to the SMS for a collaborative learning initiative within the SUN Movement. Peer to peer learning would focus on *how* decision makers and implementers perform their roles in promoting improved nutrition. Priority topics emerging from our consultations with national stakeholders would be a good starting point (See the steps set out in section 2). A key issue for country to country exchange is how to strengthen national KML systems and ensure that knowledge and learning inform decision making and actions.

There were also calls for more on the job, on-going support for GFPs. The REACH initiative was praised by some stakeholders for its support to GFPs. In addition to facilitating South to South Cooperation, some informants during our consultations, (e.g. German Ministry of Agriculture) emphasised the importance of learning exchange between Northern and Southern line ministries.

The proposed way forward for a SUN peer-to-peer learning initiative is as follows:

*Identification of learning needs:* National MSPs, through the KML-SWGs would identify and share the priority knowledge and learning needs of different in country stakeholders (using Step 3 of the KML framework above), with the in-country support system actors as well as with the SUN GSS Regional Hubs. Learning must give additional weight to what has not worked and why.

*Identification of peer to peer learning modalities:* Regional Hubs identify appropriate learning modalities to support countries to meet their needs. Cross country learning modalities could involve formation of “learning collaboratives”; virtual and face to face dialogues; country exchange visits, on-going coaching / mentoring and other forms of on-the-job support; regional and global gatherings. Learning processes usually take place over a period of time rather than through one off events. Where there are common learning needs across regions, these can usefully be incorporated into global learning exchanges such as the Global Gatherings or other events.

*Peer to peer learning facilitators:* The SUN GSS could develop and maintain a roster of qualified facilitators who are able to facilitate cross country learning exchanges, e.g. REACH facilitators and R4D<sup>4</sup>. Strong facilitation skills are essential for ensuring learning objectives are met in a way which leads to improved capabilities and ultimately practices and actions. These facilitators in turn will need a good grasp of country realities.

*Capturing learning:* It will be important to capture the learning arising from peer to peer learning exchanges in order improve the evidence base on what works and to share

---

<sup>4</sup> During our discussion with R4D it was apparent that they have given a lot of thought to a SUN collaborative learning approach that warrants further consideration.

learning more widely. Facilitators should support participants to co-create knowledge and ensure it is captured in different knowledge products (e.g. policy briefs, guidelines, videos, infographics etc) for use in their own work and to share with others. In addition, methods for capturing learning during peer to peer exchange need to be strengthened through the preparation of background documents prior to events, and analytical documentation of lesson capture.

#### 4.2 Global coordination and SUN GSS roles in operationalising the KML system

##### > **Recommendation 4: SUN GSS agree specific contributions to the SUN KML system and reports to countries and the SUN Leadership**

The KML system outlined above requires all SUN structures to be playing complementary roles towards the shared objective of supporting countries to meet their knowledge and learning needs.

As recognised in the SUN GSS Collaboration Framework endorsed by the SUN Ex Com in January 2019, different parts of the GSS will be able to engage in joint KML activities to different extents given their mission, expertise, and capacity. Components of the SUN GSS are encouraged to engage in, and support, the collective process for providing KML support to countries as much as possible and align their own support with the commonly agreed priorities, not least those identified by countries.

The SUN GSS ways of working already agreed within the 2019 Collaboration Framework remain highly valid within the proposed KML system, i.e.

- Strengthen rather than substitute national systems and structures
- Support in-country stakeholders rather than doing the work directly where possible
- Use existing capacities and resources of Network members as much as possible
- Utilise support from wider SUN Movement and outside SUN networks when necessary
- SMS and network secretariats facilitate members to provide support
- Promote ethics, equity, equality and non-discrimination for all through rights-based approaches
- Ensure that the empowerment of women and girls is at the centre of all SUN GSS support
- Regularly report to each other and jointly to Ex Com

#### **Cross-regional coordination and global support**

To oversee regional and cross-regional support and to ensure accountability to countries and the Ex Com, the SMS Chief of Staff convenes a global SUN KML working group (consisting of RWG facilitators, KML focal points from global Networks, etc) to:

- develop and monitor a common SUN GSS KML work plan and consider resource needs and advocate for filling of resource gaps
- develop peer to peer learning approach (informed by, for example, R4D collaborative learning approach) to be used within and across regions;
- identify recurrent knowledge gaps across regions and to facilitate inter-regional learning processes, including planning of the next Global Gathering.

The KML roles and responsibilities of SMS staff will need to be clarified in job descriptions. Given the strategic importance of KML in SUN 3.0, there is a need for senior level leadership to ensure system wide buy in, coherence and strong accountability to countries and the Ex Com for the added value being provided.

A KML specialist could provide valuable day-to-day support, in particular to enable information flow and management. If the SMS appoints a KML focal point, then that

person would play an important role in collating learning, country support needs, progress in brokering country support and informing global processes. However, we suggest that responsibility for KML should be integrated as much as possible to ensure that knowledge and learning inform decision making and accountability. The SMS Chief of Staff would have a critical role to play in ensuring that the different parts of the KML system are contributing as required.

### **Accountability**

At the end of year one, the SMS Chief of Staff should report to the Ex Com on progress in relation to the above, with the opportunity for GFPs to provide their feedback on the added value the SUN GSS is providing in supporting countries to address their critical knowledge gap. The SUN GSS should demonstrate to national MSPs how support has been brokered in response to country needs and demands. The SUN GSS should also provide regular updates to the SUN Leadership including the SUN Coordinator and the Executive Committee on good practices identified, country specific and shared constraints and the support brokered to help countries address them. This country specific knowledge and learning should help the Ex Com and Coordinator to strengthen their strategic leadership roles, guiding the collective priorities and ways of working of the SUN GSS to ensure it is responsive to country needs and adding value to existing national, regional and global efforts.

### **Roles of individual SUN GSS structures**

This sub-section describes the possible contributions and tasks of different global SUN structures within the KML system. It is based on the needs of their constituents, areas of comparative advantage and track record of what has worked well in the past. It is important that there is clarity around where KML roles and responsibilities of the global support structures begin and end. We therefore recommend formulation of KML plans of action for each SUN global support structure. We would also hope to see greater coordination around KML between the SUN GSS leading potentially to a joint KML plan of action and greater learning from each-other's KML activities. Specific roles and responsibilities of different SUN global structures are suggested below.

#### *Executive Committee*

- Commits to use country analyses to inform Ex Com strategic role in reviewing progress in implementing SUN 3.0 strategy, identifying challenges faced by countries and guiding the SUN GSS to provide tailored country support
- Assesses the added value of SUN GSS brokered support to countries
- Government focal points on the Ex Com liaise with other GFPs in their regions to promote commitment to the assessment and strengthening of national KML systems
- Ex Com members from SUN networks encourage members of their networks to feed into the country analyses of good practices and support needs and leverage their capacities to help meet those needs
- Ex Com discusses and clarifies who is best placed to lead and host a Global Knowledge Hub for nutrition

#### *Lead Group*

- Heads of organisations sitting on the Lead Group are invited to commit their organisations to align their support to countries with the priority needs identified by countries and the coordinated KML support brokered through the SUN GSS.

#### *SUN Movement Secretariat*

- Working with another SUN GSS partner and communication specialist develop an infographic and Vlog of the national KM framework developed in this

document for country level use. Also develop a set of indicators based on the framework, and, after pressure testing with a number of pilot countries, standardise these in order to incorporate into the JAA process and MEAL reporting.

- Convene and facilitate Regional Working Groups, in close liaison with regional level actors where appropriate.
- In consultation with the wider GSS and regional actors decide on the definition of regions
- Collate good practices and country support needs globally and ensure good practices are communicated and inform support, e.g. through Regional Working Groups and the Global Knowledge Hub
- Engage in knowledge creation where the SMS has comparative advantage. For example, lesson learning around how to strengthen linkages between SUN structures and nutrition clusters at country level, budget tracking and analysis of gaps between domestic allocation and expenditure.
- Continue the SMS Newsletter but consider enhancing its utility through strengthened collation and curation of articles around themes, (e.g. integration of nutrition into sector plans), and synthesis of findings as learning briefs or in newsletter editorials. The current newsletter editor may benefit from more technical nutrition support to this end.
- In considering the tracking of country progress, a key component of KML, the Global Nutrition Report and the SUN MEAL system both track country progress in relation to key indicators and these are communicated through the GNR country nutrition profiles and SUN country dashboards. Our consultations support the GNR taking on the lead role in tracking country progress and strengthening its country and sub-regional profiles. The SUN Movement should focus on the provision and brokering of support to countries. However, as a key user of the country nutrition profiles, the SUN Movement should be actively involved in developing them further and ensure that they are used to inform global support to countries. The separation of tracking and support functions is also desirable in recognition of the possible tensions between the two.

#### *SUN Global Networks – general*

- Encourage and support national networks to engage in national KLM systems
- Collate good practices and country support needs from national counterparts and feed them into the Regional Working Groups to inform collective country analyses
- Network secretariats could share country analyses with network members to guide their country support
- During periodic network calls discuss country priorities and needs and how the network can best leverage support to respond to country needs
- Continue to facilitate cross country and peer to peer learning within networks

#### *UN Nutrition*

Prior to the formation of UN Nutrition, UNN worked at global level through a team of 10 and at country level through UN REACH coordinators in up to 14 countries. The global team carried out numerous KM functions including producing the Compendium of Actions for Nutrition (CAN), writing guidance for UN country teams and capturing and disseminating best practices through a newsletter as well as in other publications. The in-country REACH coordinators undertook a variety of tasks including the production of country nutrition analysis papers, policy and plan overviews and nutrition stakeholder and action mapping.

The KML role of the REACH coordinators has in some instances been the basis for multi-sectoral nutrition plans, e.g. in Myanmar, or led to the establishment of KML portals as in Nepal. The role has generally been instrumental in strengthening country

data management and knowledge brokering.

The transformation of UNN into UN Nutrition will inevitably mean a reduction in capacity at global level as the number of staff are reduced. However, the new structure is intended to strengthen coherence between UN agency nutrition activities and close the loop between global and country level. KML is one of the four key functions of UN Nutrition. Important UN Nutrition KML roles going forward are;

- Support the identification and implementation of national nutrition plan priorities and help assess the degree of evidence and key knowledge gaps for these priorities. While much of this can be done at country level, improved global guidance is required. This could potentially be undertaken through adaptation and updating of the Compendium of Action for Nutrition for country level use. Resources on the Africa Development Bank website may support this process<sup>5</sup>.
- A country knowledge brokering role (as per REACH) should be encouraged but carefully targeted to countries where governments deem this to be a priority. If REACH objectives and activities do continue, in some countries, a focus on building KML capacity to support the MSPs and the government focal point is another clear role for UN Nutrition. In some instances, UN Nutrition staff/ REACH coordinators could help by co-chairing the KML-SWG.
- Where this REACH type capacity exists, the remit should include building on, or establishing, country stakeholder and activity mapping in order to determine the degree of coverage of nutrition specific and multi-sector nutrition actions, convergence of sectors and where, geographically there is a need for greater investments to reduce malnutrition.
- The UNN country situation nutrition analysis papers and policy and planning overviews should also be continued and incorporated into the national KML system.
- UN Nutrition could do much to support the regionalised approach to KML, i.e. it is well placed to encourage regional UN agencies to participate and contribute to the regionalised approach.
- UN Nutrition (as with UNN) should continue to invest in peer to peer and country to country learning opportunities as set out above and through collaboration with other networks in the regionalised global support structure.

#### *SUN Civil Society Network*

The SUN CSA has been one of the most active networks. A great deal of its SUN related KML work has been in the realm of advocacy and making a case for nutrition to government, i.e. working at the enabling environment level of the SUN ToC. It has also been highly involved in helping build capacity to track nutrition spending in country and conducted budget analysis training. The SUN CSA has also led the way in developing a regionalised approach to coordination and KML with a number of learning events using peer to peer learning and regular inter-regional discussions. In Phase 2 CSA implemented logging of requests from countries for information and support. This has now transitioned into the SUN Labs which has an expanded KML role.

A key additional role for CSN should be to support national KML capacity and systems. This could be through temporary secondment of staff to support the SUN GFP with KML potentially utilising pooled funds to enable the arrangement.

The role of CSN members at local level, their focus on community engagement and empowerment and the establishment of many sub-national CSAs also provides opportunity to learn about multi-sector policy, coordination, financing and programming at sub-national level. This should continue to be an important focus of CSN KML work going forward and will complement the KML work of other GSS.

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Africa Development Bank has produced a report on the strength of evidence for impact of a range of nutrition specific and sensitive interventions.*

CSN's important work supporting country financial tracking and budget analysis must also continue. Close coordination and/or collaboration with the finance tracking work of SMS is essential and it seems important too that such work should also involve SDN collaboration.

The CSN's significant experience of regional knowledge and learning exchanges clearly have the potential to inform and guide other networks in a regionalised approach to KML.

Finally, the new SUN LABS which are currently being piloted, are undoubtedly a step up from the previous data-based logging of requests for support from countries. This is being carefully evaluated for effectiveness before being rolled out further.

#### *SUN Business Network*

There are currently 14 established and 17 emerging SBNs. The SBN is the most unique of the Networks in that there are few if any, similar business coordination networks which convene in order to improve nutrition. Arguably, the SBNs have more to prove in terms of achievements and value add than other networks. SBN at global level has been proactive in terms of its KML and efforts to demonstrate impact.

Global SBN have produced guidance on managing conflict of interest, a network monitoring toolkit, a logic model and a set of SBN results framework indicators (16) to measure progress. This is underpinned by a theory of change starting with improved enabling environments, leading to increased consumer awareness and demand for nutritious foods leading to better health and nutrition. There have also been annual meetings for peer to peer exchange across countries and regions, active capture of learning and good practices, evaluations and a mid-term review.

While the SBN M&E system generates useful information around activities, outputs and outcomes, it is not possible to determine what impact, country SBNs are having on people's nutrition. There are a number of reasons for this; there are data on outputs and outcomes, (e.g. no of government departments sensitised to role of business in nutrition, no of businesses making commitments and more nutritious or fortified foods) but there is no sense of scale of outputs/outcomes or the degree to which populations are dependent upon, or have access to, markets. Mapping of data is another gap as it is unclear to what extent SME practices are changing at sub-national level and in which areas of a country.

The SBN M&E system could be strengthened to provide more understanding of impact. While there are data on outputs and outcomes, (e.g. no of businesses making more nutritious products or fortified foods) there are no data on scale of outputs/outcomes or context, e.g. the degree to which populations are dependent upon, or have access to, markets. Mapping of data is another gap as it is unclear to what extent SME practices are changing at sub-national level and in which areas of a country.

It should also be possible to include more indicators on how governments are being influenced and resulting legislative change. The EBANI nutrition index employed by GAIN has over 20 indicators on this. Furthermore, as some of the SBN supported companies progress they receive grants and loans from organisations like GAIN, as a form of encouragement to continue 'good work'. The M&E system could endeavour to capture this type of information to understand how SMEs are progressing in the collective private sector nutrition effort.

#### *SUN Donor Network*

The SDN has undertaken a variety of KML activities including production of guidance on how to establish country level SDN ToR and it has also piloted a country level reporting format to document progress, achievements and constraints. Collectively (as part of SDN) and individually, donors have shown immense commitment and engagement with the aims and objectives of the SUN Movement and have invested accordingly.

Donors are particularly well placed to capture knowledge and learning in a number of key areas critical to the scaling up nutrition agenda and should be encouraged to go further in this work:

- Tracking government domestic spend on nutrition and any gaps between allocation and expenditure including the causes of these gaps and how they can be minimised.
- Improving the accuracy of tracking nutrition sensitive spending by government
- Generation of sustainable new and innovative forms of financing for nutrition, e.g. through taxation, private sector, etc
- Ways for governments in fragile contexts to transition from humanitarian financing to longer term financing in order to maximise programming to prevent malnutrition amongst chronically vulnerable population groups
- Support governments with limited access to direct budget support to improve their financing transparency to encourage greater direct budget support

This type of KML could be conducted with other networks, e.g. the CSN, or through TA. Donors should also enable co-financing for peer to peer and country to country learning including between donor organisations.

In addition, the SDN could strengthen national and global KML capacity through;

- Co-financing national KML system development
- Support identification and investments to fill priority research gaps-global/regional
- Invest in sub-national level capabilities to meet knowledge and learning needs

#### 4.3 A Global Knowledge Hub

Knowledge in the nutrition sphere has numerous creators and outlets via published literature, global and regional reports, policy briefs, programmatic briefs, normative



**Recommendation 5: Advocate for the establishment or strengthening of an existing Global Knowledge Hub, outside of the SUN architecture, to better signpost knowledge and facilitate filling of critical knowledge gaps.**

guidance documents, training tools, recorded webinars, blogs, dashboards, accountability tracking/reporting etc, which can be accessed via web-based platforms spanning the nutrition specific and sensitive sectors (health, food systems and diets, social protection etc) and managed by a multitude of institutions and agencies.

Knowing what knowledge has been generated, by whom, and where this knowledge can be accessed is challenging at any level but arguably, more so for national actors. How the relevance or validity of the knowledge should be judged and, critically, how knowledge transfers to action in order to effect change for better outcomes and impact is equally complex.

The multiplicity of institutions and initiatives in the nutrition sphere was recognised in the first Lancet nutrition series and these have grown and, are still growing in number and complexity given the increased attention to nutrition by the traditional actors (bilateral donors, multi-lateral agencies and non-governmental organisations) via private foundations and global initiatives including the SUN Movement (e.g. the Global Nutrition Report, Nutrition for Growth, Decade of Action for Nutrition, Global Nutrition Summit). The 'crowded' nutrition arena, on the one hand signifies that the much-needed focus on tackling global malnutrition remains but it brings with it, inherent risks in terms of knowledge duplication, re-inventing wheels and lack of knowledge creation in key areas. Within this complex system, the knowledge generated needs to directly inform decision making and action at country level as a priority as well as informing regional and global priorities. To actively support the uptake of knowledge and its links to action, a Global

Knowledge Hub (GKH) is recommended which will serve as the ‘go to’ platform or ‘one stop shop’ for knowledge.

This is not a new idea but rather, the need for a ‘space’ which fulfils a number of functions has been discussed and advocated for previously and continues to be a recognised unmet need. It is given added impetus by the elevated importance given to KML in the SUN Movement Strategy for Phase 3. Prior ideas around the formation of a SUN Academy are similar to a GKH but with a narrower focus on SUN related knowledge and learning. A GKH should sit outside of the SUN ‘architecture’ to ensure it draws on all sources of knowledge, is available to all countries (whether SUN signatories or not) and to avoid any tensions between knowledge creation / curation and the political mobilisation and country support functions of the SUN Movement. By being positioned outside the Movement, its existence beyond the ‘life’ of the SUN Movement is more likely to be sustained. Our consultations at all levels call for greater curation of key sources of knowledge on what works in different sectors and the signposting of this to support actions at country level. There already exist a number of initiatives which collate or signpost knowledge on what works which can be better harnessed and these have been mapped and are available in a separate document on request<sup>6</sup>.

Whilst the GKH would sit outside the SUN architecture, it is vital to the Movement as it will serve the knowledge needs of SUN member countries through strengthened curation, signposting and the filling of knowledge gaps that impede implementation of services and activities. It would benefit from the Senior Leadership of the Movement playing an advocacy role given its wide-ranging influence and can provide an advocacy role to support its realisation. However, the GKH should not incur the SMS or other members of the GSS in terms of workload or resourcing but rather, should be a ‘light touch’ rather than a leadership role in joining in the process of discussions with existing KML entities which may have both the interest and capability to host the GKH<sup>7</sup>.

The functions, practicalities, cost and likely ‘candidates’ to host a GKH warrants more in-depth scoping and discussion with existing knowledge providers/curators and others in the nutrition sphere. At a minimum, the functions of a Hub would include the following.

1. Collate and signpost existing knowledge on what works (evidence, good practices, lessons learnt, guidance (guidelines, frameworks, tools, teaching aids etc) as well as what hasn’t worked.
2. Increase the coherence and efficiency of knowledge transfer, streamline knowledge and act as the main institutional memory for the nutrition sector.
3. Flag to key actors where knowledge creation and curation is being duplicated and inform realignment of support investments as appropriate.
4. Identify knowledge gaps with priority afforded to the ‘how’ and impact of implementation and support the identification of opportunities to fill these gaps.
5. Provide a high level of search engine functionality through the use of artificial intelligence and algorithms which provide ready access to the specific information needs of country stakeholders, regions and global actors.

Considerations for hosting the GKH should include the ability of the host or hosts to be independent, neutral and impartial so that knowledge is ‘democratised’ in the sense that it avoids reflecting the particular interests of individual organisations/institutions. The hosting body would need a good understanding of national and sub-national implementation needs and be able to deliver a highly interactive and accessible platform serving the needs of all countries concerned with tackling malnutrition. The identification of existing initiative/platforms would be an important starting point so that the GKH builds on what already exists in order to lower resource costs.

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, the various Lancet Series on nutrition, the SUN / UNN Compendium of Actions for Nutrition, the WHO global knowledge hub for nutrition and e-learning library, WFP Centres of Excellence, the Food Systems Dashboard and the African Development Bank resources on increasing nutrition sensitivity of sectors.

<sup>7</sup> It was outside the scope of this assignment to recommend potential GKH hosting entities though there are KML providers who may well wish to assume this role.

# Annex 1

## List of people and groups consulted

Name	Designation
<b>National</b>	
Felix Phiri	Malawi GFP
Mangani Chilala Katundu	Associate Professor of Food and Nutrition Security, University of Malawi
Dr Ferew Lemma	Ethiopia GFP
Sisay Sinamo	Ethiopia Seqota Declaration Programme Delivery Unit
Musonda Mofu	Zambia GFP
Freddie Mubanga	Government of Zambia
Dr Lwin Mar Hlaing	Myanmar GFP
Martha Nyagay	Kenya SUN CSA-Nutrition International
Edgar Okoth	Kenya SUN CSA-Nutrition International
Marian Baidu Bangura	UN REACH Facilitator Sierra Leone
Soe Nyi Nyi	UN REACH Facilitator Myanmar
Uduak Igbeka	SBN Africa Manager
Ibiso Ivy King-Harry	SBN Nigeria
Ridwan Sayed Muntasir	SBN Bangladesh
Sulaiman Sowe	Irish Aid, Sierra Leone /Former REACH facilitator Sierra Leone
Dr Charinthy	REACH Cambodia
Dr Ung	REACH Cambodia
Dr Bulbul	Bangladesh GFP
Dr Otto Tean	Papua New Guinea MoH Technical Support Unit
Thiri May Kyaw	Myanmar Information Management Unit
Shon Campbell	Myanmar Information Management Unit
Temina Mkumwa	Nutrition Coordinator USAID Tanzania
Judith Kabore	Senegal CSA, CSN Regional Coordinator, ACF
Irshad Danish	Pakistan CSA, CSN Regional Coordinator
Mathews Mhuru	Zambia CSA, CSN Regional Coordinator
Seydou Ndiaye	Senegal CSA

## Annex 1 List of people and groups consulted (cont)

Name	Designation
<b>Global and Regional</b>	
Richard Manning	Independent Consultant
Ben Siddle	Irish Aid, SUN Donor Network
Abigail Perry	DFID, SUN Donor Network
Mary McCarthy	Irish Aid, SUN Donor Network
SUN MEAL Advisory Group	Attended meeting
SUN Donor Network	Attended meeting
Paul Isenman	Independent Consultant
Melanie Bruns	SUN Donor Network Facilitator
Rebecca Heidkamp	John Hopkins University
Cara Flowers	SUN Civil Society Network
Cecilia Ruberto	SUN Civil Society Network
Christopher Twiss	SUN Civil Society Network
Cristelle Hure	ACF Regional Advocacy Coordinator / SUN Executive Committee
Lawrence Hadaad	GAIN / SUN Executive Committee
Ivan Butina	UNICEF HQ - Knowledge Management
Andy Rooke	SUN Civil Society Network
Zoe Bennell	SUN Civil Society Network
Hollydente Sedutto	Knowledge Management, Communications & Reporting UN Network Secretariat
Farah Sbytte	World Food Programme
Patricia Palma de Fulladolsa	Director, Nutrition SICA
Myriam Hebabi	Project Manager Nutrition International
Geneviève Stone	SUN Business Network
Emily Haneghan	SUN Business Network
Jonathan Tench	SUN Business Network
Harriet Torlesse	Regional Nutrition Advisor, UNICEF South Asia

## Annex 1 List of people and groups consulted (cont)

Name	Designation
<b>Global and Regional (Cont)</b>	
Ms Kefilwe Rhoba Moalosi	NEPAD Project Manager – Nutrition
Ernest Aube	ECOWAS
Christiane Rudert plus 1	Regional Nutrition Advisor, UNICEF East & Southern Africa Region
Augustin Flory	R4D
Yashodhara Rana	R4D
Hans Christoph Eiden	German Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Mysbah Balagamwala	OPM Oxford
Neha Raykar	OPM Delhi
Catherine Chazaly	Independent Consultant SMS and GNC
Jane Keylock	NutritionWorks
Jeneice Alvey	USAID, SUN Donor Network
Stineke Oenema	UN SCN, UN Nutrition
Denise Costa	UN SCN-KM lead
Rebecca Brown	NutritionWorks
Tamsin Walters	NutritionWorks
Renata Micha	Global Nutrition Report Chair
Jennifer Renzaho	WFP
Ilaria Schibba	WFP
Simone Gie	WFP
Adriana Bianco	WFP
Anna Graziano	WFP
Geofrey Lairumbi	African Leadership for Nutrition
Cheikh Sarr	African Leadership for Nutrition
Tisungani Zimpeta	African Leadership for Nutrition

## Annex 1 List of people and groups consulted (cont)

Name	Designation
<b>SMS</b>	
Gerda Verburg	SUN Movement Coordinator
Ellen Barclay	SMS Chief of Staff
Mairead Peterson	Policy and Strategy Specialist
Debora Di Dio	Senior Nutrition and Strategy Advisor
Iselin Danbolt	Communications Specialist
Maria Pizzini	Strategy Development Focal Point
Jeffrey Tudor	Head of Communications and Advocacy
Jean Sebastien Koussi	Country Results and Finance Team
William Knechtel	Country Results and Finance Team
Philip Dive	Country Liaison Team Coordinator
Morgane Daget	Policy Specialist
Savita Mala	Policy Specialist
Samantha Rudick	Policy Specialist
Stephen Williams	Policy Specialist
San Njona	Policy Specialist
Sonia Ancellin-Panzani	Policy Specialist
David Diaz	Digital Communications Specialist

## Annex 2

# Observations on past and present KML initiatives at the global and national levels

### National KML systems

Efforts to support the development of, or strengthen existing, national KML systems have largely been fragmented, and, regionally or globally led. Important globally led initiatives such as NIPN, UNN REACH and SMS facilitated JAAs have helped strengthen elements of KM nationally. NIPN for example (which operates in 9 countries) focusses on harnessing national information systems to answer key nutrition policy and investment related questions. UN REACH has focussed on helping countries disaggregate and represent programme coverage data and identify gaps in coverage. Supported by SMS and global networks, the JAAs have focussed on the enabling environment of country SUN structures and financing indicators.

Most countries have some form of national nutrition information system (NIS). These typically involve periodic DHSS and MICS surveys, growth monitoring programmes, or annual cross-sectional nutrition surveys undertaken by UN and INGOs – particularly in fragile and conflict affected contexts. Ministries of Health collect and collate information on high impact nutrition programme (nutrition specific) delivery and utilisation and many have knowledge platforms where these data are stored and accessed. A significant number of countries have developed more sophisticated KML processes and platforms. Five out of the 12 countries interviewed as part of this work, had nationally owned KML platforms which performed a variety of functions and analytical roles beyond the normal remit of NIS.

The evolution, governance and modus operandi of these KML platforms vary with each having different strengths and weaknesses. For example, the Myanmar MIMU employs sophisticated GIS tools to present data with the potential for highly disaggregated spatial mapping (situation analysis). The Tanzania, multi-sector nutrition information system contains data across sectors that are relevant to nutrition and is increasingly being used to inform decisions about multi-sector nutrition programming (what is needed and what works). The Pakistan SUNAR located in the Ministry of Planning but established by the SUN Academic network has become a critical repository for all nutrition related research in country (situation analysis, what is needed and what works, monitoring and evaluation) while the Somalia FSNAU which migrated from the UN to government over a period of years, collates and analyses food security and nutrition data which are critical to humanitarian planning and IPC analysis (situation analysis and monitoring and evaluation). While the strengths of each system differ, so do the weaknesses. The MIMU has limited access to nutrition data due to government sensitivity around nutrition statistics while the SUNAR lacks human resource capacity for analysis and solution-oriented KM. The FSNAU is constantly negotiating funding issues.

In addition to these nationally owned and driven KM systems, there are multiple nutrition KML systems set up by national nutrition clusters in cluster activated countries. These systems tend to rely upon INGO and UN agency led surveys, evaluations and research and are utilised to inform humanitarian programming scale up and phasing out. Where crises are protracted, there may be opportunities (as with Somalia) to migrate the platforms and capacity over to government. This opportunity is increasingly part of discussions around strengthening the humanitarian and development nexus.

### Global KML activities

#### **Prior and existing global led KML**

Important KML activities have been undertaken in the first two phases of the Movement some of which remain and others, have ceased. Included in the latter category are the SUN 'In Practice Briefs', the BRAIN database, the DFID TAN SUN-KM collaboration, the Implementation Science for

Nutrition (SISN) initiative and thematic Communities of Practice. In SUN's second phase, the SMS sought ways to coordinate the activities of a number of international academic and research organisations undertaking KML relevant work, but this didn't progress. The ongoing activities can be categorised as those directly coordinated by the SMS and SUN Networks, and, KML coordinated by others as outlined below.

### **SMS coordinated KML**

A considerable amount of KML related work is coordinated by the SMS including the SUN Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) system, the SUN Joint Annual Assessment (JAAs) which partly inform the MEAL, the SUN Global Gatherings (every 2 years), 'Deep Dive' narrative reports on for example, stunting reduction and, more recently the Covid 19 learning webinars, and country situation reports. Added to this, the SMS has an active website and produces a Newsletter each month profiling country stories, news from SUN supporters and from the SUN Networks.

### **SUN Network coordinated KML**

Each Network has its own approach to KML. For example, the SUN Business Network (SBN) has a vibrant M&E system and hosts regional learning events. The SUN Civil Society (CSN) also hosts regional learning events and actively foster country exchanges and peer to peer learning in addition to populating a data base which records specific country CSN requests for support. There has also been the inventive work undertaken by UN REACH and coordinated by UNN to map in country resources, activities and unmet needs in relation to levels of undernutrition. In addition, UN REACH have produced country policy overviews of nutrition.

### **KML coordinated by other stakeholders**

Important KML related activities taking place outside the SUN Movement architecture and include work for example being undertaken by IFPRI including Stories of Change and the Exemplar studies which provide analysis and evidence of changes in stunting across a number of countries to name a few. The Global Nutrition Report (GNR) and the allied regional and country profiles provide annual updates on global and country progress towards major nutrition targets.

Overall, considerable knowledge is generated in (and outside) the SUN Movement and some of the this fulfils important functions contributing to decision-making within countries and at global level. However, as there has been no comprehensive mapping or evaluation of SUN Movement KML activities, outputs and outcomes, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of KM and the extent to which KML fulfils the four functions set out in the SUN Phase 3.0 strategy. The SUN Strategic Review alighted on the importance of KML for the Movement which is reflected in the four functions as set out in the SUN Phase 3.0 Strategy<sup>9</sup>. A few of the KML related conclusions and recommendations are outlined in below.

### **Extracts from the SUN Movement Strategic Review**

[There is an] inherent pressure for countries to report progress rather than objectively identify areas that are faltering within a country's multisectoral nutrition response.

SUN, and specifically the SMS, can play an important role in facilitating SUN countries that face similar challenges in working together to better understand the problems, as well as identify and test possible solutions.

There is strong interest in enhanced country-to-country dialogue and exchange of experience....and...the SUN Movement should expand opportunities for knowledge exchange amongst member countries and networks.

The SMS should focus on providing countries with a range of resources that strengthen and support nutrition action. This role would include synthesising and disseminating nutrition information in a way that is useful to countries; providing links to evidence on critical nutrition issues.

<sup>9</sup> The four function are: 1. Learn as much as possible about what works (and why and how) and share know-how about what works, 2. Be more accountable to each other and to people at risk of malnutrition, 3. Course correct actions at the country system and CAP levels within the bigger picture at the national, regional and global levels, and, 4. Evaluate the SUN value add.

Based on the country, regional and global interviews conducted, the mapping of significant KML related initiatives and the documents reviewed for this assignment, six areas which are constraining more effective KML are identified below.

#### **Constraints to more effective KML**

1. Country and global SUN stakeholders are either overwhelmed with information and knowledge or, do not know where to find the type of information and knowledge needed for planning and decision-making.
2. Globally driven and led KM which relies upon reporting from country level are sometimes seen as burdensome and a distraction from national KM systems and can fail to build on or strengthen existing national (and regional where these exist) KM processes
3. KM is not sufficiently informed by, and therefore does not cater adequately for the knowledge needs of decision-makers and implementers at national level. This partly derives from an emphasis on globally driven and implemented KM and contributes to a situation where derived knowledge is not sufficiently specific to country contexts or conversely may lack external validity
4. There is a lack of prioritisation of key knowledge gaps for defined sets of stakeholders and a tendency to collect 'too much data' most of which, are not utilised. In general, there is insufficient analysis of who the knowledge is for, what level of evidence is required and how the knowledge can and should be used.
5. There is a tendency to collect large volumes of data on SUN Movement processes with less attention given to output or impact data.
6. There has been limited documentation and dissemination of key learning from peer to peer exchanges (though recent Covid-19 activities shine a light on how this can be done more effectively). There is also minimal preparation of documentation to inform this type of intensive KM approach, e.g. case studies, summaries of previous learning in policy or practice briefs and follow-up to ensure learning informs change at the country level.

## Annex 3

# Terms of Reference to support the SUN Movement develop a KML strategy & operating model

### Scope of work/responsibilities

The consultant will be responsible for supporting the SUN Movement through an in-depth assessment of knowledge management and learning (KML) needs, audiences, and existing efforts, including identification of critical gaps. This work will reflect and incorporate the findings of the Strategic Review of the SUN Movement and the Road Map 3 draft strategy due out for consultation in mid-July.

The assignment will contribute to wider SUN Movement efforts to support countries to strengthen their capabilities to scale up nutrition programmes and accelerate progress in reducing malnutrition in all its forms. The assignment will support the development of the SUN Movement knowledge management and learning strategy and operating model, aligned with the wider SUN 3.0 strategy and roadmap.

The consultant will be accountable to the SMS focal point for this work and report verbally on work progress regularly.

In keeping with the ethos of the Movement, the approach to this work will be driven by engagement with and understanding of country KML needs. As such, the work will start with country level scoping and move onto the other activities as set out below. Note these are not strictly sequential, rather they are concurrent.

The SMS has indicated that they wish to see this work completed by the end of October. The below is based on the assumption the work can commence by the last week of June.

The new SUN Movement KML strategy should build on the strengths and address the weaknesses of existing approaches and be integrated into the wider SUN 3.0 strategy. At the start of the assignment it will be important for the consultant to receive a comprehensive briefing including from some ExCom members, the SMS and Network secretariats and members on existing approaches within the SUN Movement for identifying and addressing KML needs, as well as the process for developing the SUN Movement strategy and roadmap for SUN 3.0. A more detailed mapping of current KML approaches and actions will be undertaken within Activity 2 (see below).

### Main activities

1. Develop an understanding of country level definitions of, needs and contributions to KML through discussions with country actors across a wide variety of contexts (different regions, levels of fragility etc.). Understanding country level considerations around KML is essential. This will include explorations on level of buy in from countries to own KML, capacity of country level actors for KML and understandings of what is needed for capture, documentation, dissemination and influencing. These discussions will also be used to explore a working definition of KM within the SUN Movement.
2. Comprehensively map what is already being offered, can be improved and/or better coordinated; including within the SUN Movement Global Support Services (GSS) and broader partners in terms of knowledge sharing and learning: This should include global, regional and country platforms to understand who is doing what and how platforms can be adapted for

SUN, how the structures can be enhanced and how the SUN GSS can position itself to facilitate what is already happening in the field of KML.

3. Determining a SUN Movement-wide definition of what KM is and what it does, to further work toward the SUN Movement's vision and overarching goals, including a set of agreed principles of KML: Using discussions from 1 and 2 above, available literature (light touch review) obtain a workable definition (including principles) of KML for the Movement- defining what it is (what it isn't) and what we want it to achieve.
4. Analysing findings and developing deliverables: Presenting existing and potential approaches to KML of relevance to the SUN Movement, including innovative, creative, and effective ways to capture and share technical knowledge, leverage good practices, and improve the effectiveness of the SUN Movement

## Deliverables

1. Short report of overall findings including a working definition of KML for the SUN Movement with list of principles, landscape mapping of KML actors at the global, regional and country level, synthesis of country level KML support needs based on 12 country analysis and recommendations on KML innovations. The report will make suggestions for a KML operating model for the SUN Movement including the role of the SMS and Global Networks in ensuring a sustainable flow of knowledge and learning within the Movement.
2. Two webinars to present the findings with power point presentations made available to participants; TA providers, members of the four SUN Networks, SMS, Ex Com and another for national SUN stakeholders.

A final deliverable will be a remote briefing for the newly recruited SMS KML focal point based on findings to help her/his onboarding as instructed by the SMS.